

FBIS

DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 089

7 May 1982

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Moscow Radio on Usefulness of USSR-U.S. Summit [Kuznetsov]	AA 1
Political Scientist on U.S. Nuclear Polemics [Shakhnazarov in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 28 Apr]	AA 2
Proletariat Cited as Nucleus of Peace Movement [Vesnin in VOVOYE VREMYA 1 May]	AA 3
Chervov Comments on British Arms Program [Morozov in Bratislava PRAVDA 4 May]	AA 5
TASS Cites Carter on Soviet-U.S. Summit Talks	AA 6
IZVESTIYA: 'War Psychosis' Thrives in U.S. [6 May]	AA 7
TRUD Article Comments on U.S. Arms Buildup [7 May]	AA 7
'Official Answer' on UN Disarmament Session	AA 8
Group of Parliamentarians Arrive in Moscow [PRAVDA 3 May]	AA 8

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Further Details on CEMA Cooperation Booklet	BB 1
---	------

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

NATO Pamphlet 'Estimates' Balance of Forces [Bogachev]	CC 1
--	------

FALKLAND ISLANDS CRISIS

British Defense Ministry Reports Planes Missing	DD 1
Cease-fire 'Essential' for Peaceful Settlement	DD 1
Argentine 'Condition'	DD 1
Nott: Argentines Must Withdraw	DD 1
Thatcher Statements	DD 2
Major Showdown 'Imminent' in South Atlantic [Anichkin]	DD 2
Ireland Raps 'Discriminatory' EEC Sanctions	DD 3
NATO Planning Group Meets; Discusses Falklands	DD 3
USSR Afro-Asian Committee Issues Statement	DD 3
Reportage on U.S. Role in Falklands Issue	DD 4
Kornilov Commentary	DD 4
'Complicated Political Knot' [Zorin]	DD 4
'Unequivocal' U.S. Backing	DD 5
Pentagon Seen as 'Exploiting' Falklands Conflict [Bandura in IZVESTIYA 5 May]	DD 6
Latest Developments in Falklands Crisis Reviewed	DD 9

UNITED STATES & CANADA

IZVESTIYA Hits Rogers Call for Wider NATO Action	[4 May]	A	1
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: U.S. Harbors Nazi War Criminals	[7 May]	A	1
PRAVDA Article Examines U.S. 'Psychological War'	[Zhukov]	A	2

CHINA

Bush Mission: PRC Concessions on Taiwan		B	1
[Agafonov in IZVESTIYA	6 May]		

NORTHEAST ASIA

Vinogradov Views Japan-U.S. Security Treaty		C	1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA	29 Apr]		
USSR-DPRK Trade Accord for 1982 Signed in Moscow		C	2
Filatov Article on DPRK Army Anniversary		C	2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA	25 Apr]		
Ustinov Receives Mongolian Defense Minister		C	2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA	22 Apr]		

SOUTH ASIA

DRA Celebrates April Revolution Anniversary		D	1
Embassy Reception	[PRAVDA 28 Apr]	D	1
Makeyev Return From Kabul	[PRAVDA 30 Apr]	D	1
Doctor, Agronomist, Teacher on DRA Mission		D	1
[Mironov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA	2 May]		
Visit to India by SRV Foreign Minister Reviewed		D	1
Briefs: Bridge to Afghanistan		D	2

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

'Slander' on SRV Workers in USSR Rejected		E	1
[Ilinskiy in IZVESTIYA	4 May]		
Romanov Meets Kampuchea's Heng Samrin in Laos		E	3
[PRAVDA	4 May]		
Tikhonov Greets Western Samoa's Wa'ai Colone		E	3

EASTERN EUROPE

PRAVDA Notes Sejm Remarks on National Accord	[5 May]	F	1
Comparison of Polish Article on CIA Activity		F	1
PRAVDA Describes Polish Cooperation at AES		F	2
[Baygarov,	22 Apr]		
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Views Yugoslav Army Party Parley	[28 Apr]	F	2
Kosovo Province LCY Conference Reviews Problems		F	2
[PRAVDA	29 Apr]		

WESTERN EUROPE

PRAVDA Reviews Soviet-Finnish Contacts	[2 May]	G	1
French Political Commentator Visits Kazakh SSR		G	2
PRAVDA Notes Turkey Unwilling To Aid RDF	[Filippov, 3 May]	G	2
IZVESTIYA on Plans for NATO Forces in Denmark	[3 May]	G	3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

'Arafat Interviewed in Beirut by Moscow TV	H	1
Brutents Continues Commentary on Mideast Issues	H	1
[Kuwait AL-WATAN 25 Apr]		
Leaders Confer With Visiting Iraqi Officials	H	5
Patolichev, 'Awdah [PRAVDA 28 Apr]	H	5
Arkhipov, At-Tawfiq [PRAVDA 1 May]	H	5

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

PRAVDA Publishes Ortega Speech at Kremlin Dinner [5 May]	K	1
Romanov Receives Nicaraguan Delegation 6 May	K	3
USSR To Help Cuba Build Atomic Power Station	K	3
Report on Chilean Socialist Party Document	K	4

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU Leaders Attend PRAVDA Anniversary Meeting	R	1
Yakut Days of Culture	R	1
PRAVDA Editorial Hails May Day Festival [30 Apr]	R	1

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Gas Minister Interviewed by NOVOYE VREMYA	S	1
Changes in System of Metal Production Urged	S	1
[Kulikov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Apr]		

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

SELSKAYA ZHIZN Reports Projected May Temperatures [1 May]	T	1
---	---	---

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Eight Cosmos-Class Satellites Launched 6 May	U	1
TASS Reports Earthquake in Southern Republics	U	1

MOSCOW RADIO ON USEFULNESS OF USSR-U.S. SUMMIT

LD061410 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 5 May 82

[Text] There has been wide world response to Soviet President Brezhnev's reply to a question from the correspondent of the newspaper PRAVDA about a summit meeting with President Reagan. Our news analyst Vladlen Kuznetsov makes the following comment:

President Brezhnev proposed a Soviet-American summit at the 26th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party held in February last year. The White House response then was rather cool. Washington said conditions were not ripe for a summit. Avoiding a dialogue with the USSR, the United States administration tried then to break down any political dialogue between East and West, using the events in Poland as the reason. But the meeting between President Brezhnev and West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt on the banks of the Rhine last November continued a series of summit talks between representatives of East and West. It has taken the White House more than a year to return to the idea that Moscow advanced. The point is that the idea has in the meantime won the support of a great many people around the world who are concerned with the international tensions and the stagnation in Soviet-American relations. One public opinion poll in the United States has shown that a vast majority of Americans are in favor of an American-Soviet summit and consider it useful.

Since midterm elections to the U.S. Congress are due this autumn, the Washington administration is forced to consider the views of the voters more than at other times. Speaking to newsmen early in April, President Reagan raised the issue of a possible meeting with the Soviet leader in New York during the special session in June of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament. And yet that was not a carefully weighed proposal but rather a passing remark about a behind-the-scenes chance meeting that would be short and informal.

The Soviet Union has a different idea for a summit. It offers a solid, well-prepared meeting which, as President Brezhnev stressed, would be in keeping with the great responsibility of the two countries for the world situation and that would justify the hopes pinned on it. Is it really normal that the leaders of the world's two largest powers haven't had any personal contact yet, haven't outlined to one another their views of the world situation and have not exchanged ideas on how to overcome the present tensions, the slipping toward the cold war and the threat of nuclear disaster?

All of us can see who has really been dodging such a meeting of invented pretexts and all sorts of excuses and who is to blame for the loss of precious time. True, though, Washington has not wasted any time in one respect: It has used the time to go over to action on 44 programs of superarmaments. Washington has used the time lost for peace to make material preparations for war. The Soviet stand is different. We are convinced about the usefulness of a political dialogue at summit level. The world situation, aggravated by tensions, requires a responsible approach, energetic efforts and competent decisions -- decisions that would help the entire international community to radically turn back the currently disturbing developments, to further reduce tensions and move to disarmament.

In the early seventies, Soviet-American summit meetings not only brought about improvements in the political atmosphere; they made it possible to start limiting strategic armaments, to hold the nuclear menace in check. These meetings helped to go over to the more reliable peacetime coexistence, to more stable international security, to more intensive cooperation for mutual benefit, to a more productive political dialogue between East and West in the search for settlements of conflict and critical situations (?of unresolved) international problems. (?What) became possible to accomplish in the seventies strongly indicates that peaceful, mutually acceptable solutions are quite feasible. The political dialogue of the seventies awaits its continuation in the eighties. All objective opportunities are on hand. What was accomplished in the 10 years of easing tensions can be used with great effect now.

There are a score of international agreements that to some extent are containing the arms race along some directions. There is a large package of Soviet-American agreements dating back to the period of easing tension. There is good will on the part of the Soviet Union to reach solutions of disputed issues that divide the world through negotiations. To speak (of) more specific detail, there is a readiness by Finland and Switzerland to welcome the leaders of the two world powers and create conditions for their dialogue. As President John Kennedy said in his time, it is better to meet at the summit than at the brink of war. These words can be well applied today. In a recent radio statement, the U.S. President spoke of such relations with the Soviet Union that would not depend on a nuclear deterrent. Well, such an opportunity exists now, but it is necessary to take into account the security interests of the other side, and the dialogue must be based on honest, genuine partnership.

POLITICAL SCIENTIST ON U.S. NUCLEAR POLEMICS

PM050937 [Editorial Report] Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian on 28 April publishes on page 14 a 3,400-word article by G. Shakhnazarov, president of the Soviet Association of Political Science, under the heading "To Be or Not To Be? On the Polemic in the United States on Questions of Nuclear Strategy. Shakhnazarov notes the growing antiwar movement in West European countries, Japan and the United States and states that "Washington is making feverish efforts to halt this wave of anger which threatens to wreck the Pentagon's plans."

He goes on to outline the U.S. movement against nuclear war and in particular to discuss the article published in FOREIGN AFFAIRS by a group of former U.S. politicians and presidential aides arguing the case against the present administration's nuclear strategy. Shakhnazarov rejects "fabrications" about the "Soviet threat" and the USSR's alleged aggressiveness and blames the United States for crises and tension over the years in Cuba, Southeast Asia, Angola, the Near East, Afghanistan and Poland. The article concludes:

"Literally everywhere, it is imperialism which is really to blame for the exacerbation of the international situation. That is the dangerous force which must be restrained. That is why the Soviet Union has been forced to make sacrifices in order to create sufficient military might.

"In the present situation nuclear armaments have reached a level such that mankind's future is already in jeopardy -- to be or not to be? And now as never before restraint is needed on both sides. The more profoundly the broad people's masses throughout the world come to realize this truth, the greater will be the justification for the hope that mankind will be able to avert nuclear carnage. As L.I. Brezhnev has noted, the world is now at a fork in the road. There is still time, and this time must not be wasted."

PROLETARIAT CITED AS NUCLEUS OF PEACE MOVEMENT

PM051309 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 18, 1 May 82 pp 5-6

[Boris Vesnin article: "May Day 1982: Labor -- For Peace" -- capitalized passages published in boldface type]

[Excerpt] Today, on May Day, it must be recalled that the working class was the first to declare resolutely: No, it is not an arms race and war which meet the peoples' interests, but peace and peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. Communists uphold this stance. Today a significant proportion -- or more precisely, the vast majority -- of social democrats adhere to this position in the main. It is shared by many religious working people. It is reflected by trade unions of the most varied orientations. In other words, peace is the stance of a CLASS of the entire working class -- regardless of the part of the world in which it lives and operates -- West or East.

Of course, we must be realistic. Although an antiwar stance now typifies the workers' movement irrespective of particular currents or trends, it is manifested to different degrees and extents everywhere. And there are many "degrees" here -- from active determination to fight to the last against war, to passive sympathy for antiwar actions. And of course, the working class and the workers' movement contain islands and even entire archipelagoes which have not yet been reached by the wave of awareness of danger, still less of the need to counterpose an active stance to that danger. Let us recall, for instance, that a significant proportion of American workers are still under the influence of rightwing trade union bosses who worship military profit just as much as the bosses of the business in question do. Even these circles of the proletariat will eventually see the light. But as yet they are outside the class position of their brothers on other continents.

Nonetheless, a fact is a fact. Today, in our time, the imperialist bourgeoisie is suffering one of its biggest defeats -- defeat in the attempt to keep the "mass" well away from foreign policy and the great, tragic mystery of war and peace. THE "MASS" HAS NOW BECOME INVOLVED IN FOREIGN POLICY. IT IMPERIOUSLY DEMANDS AN ANSWER FROM THE ANCIENT KEEPERS OF THE DIPLOMATIC MYSTERIES -- AN ANSWER AND AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CRIME INHERENT IN PREPARATIONS -- PLANNED, NURTURED IN SECRET, BUT IMPLEMENTED OPENLY, BEFORE THE WHOLE WORLD'S EYES -- FOR THE MASS DESTRUCTION OF PEOPLE. AND PERHAPS FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF ALL CONSCIOUS LIFE ON THE PLANET EARTH.

This is a monstrous crime. Its truly cosmic scale has no analogy. The burden of responsibility which rests on the shoulders of its organizers is immeasurable.

...I began by saying that the working class was the first to rise against the imperialist bourgeoisie's course of preparing for a world nuclear missile war. Now I am talking about the "mass." Is this not an inaccuracy, a leap from the actual to the desirable?

No! It is not a question of the desirable. It is a question of reality. The protest raised for the first time by the working class has today become a mass, people's protest. Awareness of the dangerous nature of a new war with all its neutron, thermonuclear, bacteriological and chemical horrors is penetrating the peoples' consciousness much more deeply. That awareness rouses people's consciences. It incites them to act.

So now the columns are marching across Europe. The fighters for peace and against nuclear weapons have joined their ranks. At the same time columns are on the march in America, marching on Washington. Referendums are being held in European districts, Japanese prefectures and American states -- referendums against the bomb, against war.

The demonstrators are backed by a firm, reliable supporting force -- many millions of citizens of socialist countries. These citizens are all for peace, all against war. They actively support each and every political step in that direction.

True, some people I have spoken to in the West have asked me: Why are no columns marching on the capitals of the USSR or other socialist countries? Why do you have no referendums against the bomb? Some people are asking, and some people are trying to create or provoke in our countries some sort of analogue to the "protest movement" which exists in the West.

But to protest against what? The governments of the socialist countries are for peace, for ending the arms race. For disarmament. So to protest against THAT? Against the policy of peace?

Our governments do not put forward isolated proposals, but many dozens of practical proposals express what the socialist countries' people believe and demand. So are they suggesting that we should start a protest movement against precisely THESE proposals?

No! Nobody has ever seen a situation where people who are trying to put out a fire and prevent it from spreading turn not against the incendiaries, but against the fire brigade. The fire brigade puts out the fire -- and every normal person must seek to help it in its noble action. The socialist countries' governments are fighting to prevent war. What is needed here is not "protests" but understanding, sympathy and support.

And our countries' peoples display complete understanding of their governments' peace-loving policy. They display 100-percent sympathy with their initiatives. They support their peace proposals as well as their measures to preserve the existing military-strategic equilibrium between East and West, because they know that today that equilibrium is the guarantee of their security, the barrier in the path of the threat of war.

And this sympathy and support are expressed in all kinds of forms -- from supplementary, above-plan labor efforts to the voluntary donations by millions of people to the Soviet peace fund; from rallies and torchlit night processions at monuments to the victims of war to the collection by young people, in response to a KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA appeal, of signatures to protest against the arms race unleashed by NATO (more than 5 million signatures have already been collected!)....

Of course, the peoples (and governments) of socialist countries value highly the understanding and support for their position from members of antiwar movements abroad. It is good to know that you are not alone on the battlefield!

...Perhaps some people may try to interpret these words of mine in this way: The author is calling for the antiwar movement to be one-sidedly prosocialist and anti-Western. But this interpretation (I have met it before!) would be a flagrant distortion of the truth. The antiwar movement must be ANTIWAR. It must be aimed at PREVENTING NUCLEAR WAR. That is its noble goal. And that goal must be attained.

As for the true role in the peace struggle of particular states, public forces or political parties, the best indication of this is to be found in their practical deeds, which will be taken into account by the strictest, most impartial judge -- history.

Thus, I repeat, one of the most important changes marking our time is that the character who will eventually turn out to be the most important has emerged on the stage of world politics. The character who for centuries has been excluded from participating in actions which have essentially decided his destiny -- his destiny above all. This character is the people's masses. The working class is the nucleus.

The people's masses imperiously demand: Mankind's future must be peaceful! Down with war, long live a clear sky over the entire planet!

And that slogan is most important today. It is the worldwide slogan for this year's May Day -- May Day 1982.

CHERVOV COMMENTS ON BRITISH ARMS PROGRAM

AU051130 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 4 May 82 p 6

[APN military commentator V. Morozov interview with Col Gen Nikolay Chervov: "What Do They Need Trident-2 For? The British Government's Gamble"; place and date not given]

[Text] [Question] The Government of Great Britain has decided to acquire American Trident-2 missiles for its missile-equipped submarines. Do the needs of the country's defense require them?

[Answer] With their tactical and technical parameters, the Trident-2 missiles clearly go beyond Great Britain's defense needs. Judge for yourself -- this missile has a range of 11,000 km, an accuracy of within 90 m and carries 14 warheads, each of which has a payload of 150 kt. The nuclear potential of the four submarines that Great Britain now has will increase from 192 to 900 warheads.

According to the assessment of the U.S. Defense Department, the submarine-launched Trident-2 ballistic missile will have virtually the same combat potential as the American MX intercontinental missiles, that means that they will be first-strike weapons.

From the military viewpoint, the designation, combat potentials and method of employing these missiles are quite clear. Only one thing is not clear -- why is the Tory government taking steps which destabilize the already quite complicated situation in Europe? It claims that Britain is establishing its own "independent nuclear deterrent force." However, that is a bluff. What kind of "independence" is it when all its armed forces, and the nuclear missile forces in particular, are an appendage of the U.S. nuclear potential?

A spade must be called a spade. The real point is that this enhances Great Britain's military doctrine in the direction of strengthening its aggressive orientation. One can discern in the Trident-2 missile plans also a political goal -- to speed up even more the arms race and to complicate the situation at the Soviet-American Geneva talks.

Is it possible to describe other than as peculiar the statements of those officials who demand that Great Britain's nuclear potential not be taken into account in the balance of the two side's intermediate-range nuclear weapons in Europe because the Britons are not taking part in the talks? This "non-participation" does not change the situation. No one will ever conceive the idea that the British Trident-2 missiles might be directed against Washington and not against Soviet cities and that they must be added to the Soviet side of the scales.

We are witnesses of a paradox: The Soviet Union has adopted a decision on a unilateral moratorium and reduction of a certain number of intermediate-range nuclear devices already this year while the United States and Great Britain are markedly increasing the numbers of their analogous weapons. The Soviet Union proposes that the development of new missile-equipped submarines be limited and the modernization and development of new ballistic missiles stationed on them be banned (in the United States the Ohio submarines with Trident missiles and in the USSR the analogous "Typhoon" system) but the United States and Great Britain are ignoring this proposal and demonstratively increasing the number of these weapons. At the same time they continue to scream about a "Soviet military threat."

[Question] What has been the Tory government's response to the new peace proposals put forward by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev at the Soviet trade union congress?

[Answer] The same as the U.S. administration's response -- negative. It can be generally said that the present Conservative Government of Great Britain, which is implementing a line of full foreign political subservience to Washington's interests, in military issues is literally hanging on "Uncle Sam's" every word. The Conservative government often displays an untiring endeavor to run ahead of its NATO partners in the arms race.

That is why both Washington and London have officially and unanimously declared that the initiatives put forward by the USSR allegedly "do not go far enough."

Two things must be stressed in this connection, the first is that negative response by the United States and some of its NATO partners does not in the least adequately correspond to the gist of the Soviet proposals and that it runs counter to the positive response they have called forth in the broad political and social circles of Western Europe and even the United States itself. The second thing is that if the USSR's proposals, in the view of R. Reagan's administration and M. Thatcher's government, "do not go far enough," the United States and Great Britain are not doing anything at all in this area and are only engaged in increasing their nuclear potentials.

Like the FRG, Great Britain is papered with American military bases and arsenals of nuclear and chemical weapons. It is planning the deployment of neutron weapons, missiles with a flat trajectory and, possibly, other weapons as well. Where is this government leading its country?

The USSR has more than once submitted proposals aimed at reducing the number of nuclear arms in Europe. Washington, on the other hand, with London's active support, is persistently striving to bring about the deployment of new intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe and thus logically taking steps against achieving agreements in Geneva.

[Question] How do you assess Great Britain's assent to the deployment of the greatest number of American nuclear missiles with a flat trajectory on its territory?

[Answer] Great Britain has already designated land strips in Greenham Common (Berkshire), Cambridgeshire and some other places for establishing bases for missiles with a flat trajectory.

At the same time, the British secretary of defense declared that he sees no reason for dealing with the issue of expanding British control over the missiles with a flat trajectory which the Americans are to deploy on the territory of Great Britain. A judicious person will ask -- why? Simply because the Americans will not permit the Britons' access to their bases anyway, although they are on their territory.

When we look at things realistically, the aim is to turn Great Britain into the target for a retaliatory nuclear strike in the event of a war. This is peculiar, why do not they tell this to the people?

All people who cherish peace sincerely welcome L.I. Brezhnev's new concrete initiatives. The significance of the Soviet decision on a unilateral moratorium goes far beyond the borders of Europe. Its objective is to erect an obstacle to the arms race and to avert the threat of a world thermonuclear war. It is surprising that the Conservatives do not understand this.

TASS CITES CARTER ON SOVIET-U.S. SUMMIT TALKS

LD070632 Moscow TASS in English 0616 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Stockholm, 7 May, TASS -- Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter, speaking at a press conference here, expressed himself in favour of holding a Soviet-American summit meeting.

He expressed the hope that a meeting between Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and Ronald Reagan, President of the USA, may facilitate the resumption of the Soviet-U.S. Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

Jimmy Carter is staying in Stockholm at the invitation of the newspaper SVENSKA DAGBLADET.

IZVESTIYA: 'WAR PSYCHOSIS' THRIVES IN U.S.

LD061646 Moscow TASS in English 1546 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 6 May, TASS -- "The Washington administration is preoccupied with something quite different from the limitation of the nuclear arms race," IZVESTIYA writes today.

"Isn't it madness," the newspaper writes, "when the Pentagon, not content with the plans to deploy 108 Pershing-2 missiles on the European Continent, is already placing an additional order for 226 such missiles with military concerns...? Isn't it madness when U.S. Secretary of State Haig is categorically opposed to the renunciation of the first nuclear strike strategy in Europe?"

The article points out that "war psychosis and adventurism, which have long been assigned the status of official state policy on the Potomac, are today thriving with a vengeance. 'Bravos' for the arms race resounding from the Senate stalls and from the gallery of the House of Representatives reverberate with the echo of nuclear war. This should not be overlooked even for a moment, and the peoples do not overlook it." "The threat of nuclear war has contributed exceptionally to the growth of the ideas of struggle for peace and international security. Their time has come. And that is why human reason will have the upper hand over the madness of war-mongers," IZVESTIYA concludes.

TRUD ARTICLE COMMENTS ON U.S. ARMS BUILDUP

LD070748 Moscow TASS in English 0740 GMT 7 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 7 May, TASS -- The new billions of dollars will be used not to strengthen the United States' defences but to create a material and technical basis for Washington's imperial plans, the newspaper TRUD writes today. Commenting on the programme for building-up the American naval forces, the newspaper says that already today the West has a sufficiently strong shield. The fleets of the NATO countries have almost three times as many battleships, cruisers, destroyers and missile frigates equipped with nuclear missile weapons, than the fleets of the Warsaw Treaty countries. For the number of planes and the striking power of its naval aviation the United States exceeds almost twice similar formations of the Soviet Union.

The newspaper stresses that the naval arms race of the USA has a direct relation to the Soviet Union because it is spearheaded primarily against the USSR. The two strike aircraft carrier groups, constantly cruising the Indian Ocean, are not only a pistol aimed at the heart of Asia but also a constant threat to the security of the Soviet Union. The nuclear missiles of American warships are aimed north, at targets within the Soviet frontiers. Understandably, such an aggressive policy of the USA compels the Soviet Government to take measures in response, including those involving naval formations. But, as was stressed by Leonid Brezhnev, we do not spend and will not spend on these purposes a single rouble above what is absolutely necessary for ensuring the security of our people, of its friends and allies.

The policy of further heating up the international atmosphere and stepping up the arms race -- on land, in the air and in the world ocean -- promises nothing good to any people, including the people of the USA. And such a policy can bring a lot of trouble to all mankind, especially today when the international situation is so strained. Therefore the Soviet Government believes that it is necessary for the two opposing blocs of states to exercise maximum restraint in their military activities.

'OFFICIAL ANSWER' ON UN DISARMAMENT SESSION

LD060534 Moscow TASS in English 0521 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] New York, 6 May, TASS -- The United Nations General Assembly second special session on disarmament this summer should become an important event giving a further impetus to the U.N. efforts to reduce the military danger and achieve disarmament. As follows from the United Nations secretary-general's reports, which were published here and which feature opinions on the progress of preparations for the second special session expressed by U.N. member-states, this view is shared by most countries.

The USSR believes that more active use should be made of all the existing channels for talks on checking the arms race and ensuring disarmament and that more tangible practical results should be secured by such negotiations, says the official answer of the Soviet Union. The significance of such talks becomes especially great now that the unprecedented arms build-up makes one concerned about the further development of international relations.

GROUP OF PARLIAMENTARIANS ARRIVES IN MOSCOW

PM060845 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 May 82 p 4

[Text] TASS -- An international group of parliamentarians involved with topical problems of disarmament arrived in Moscow 2 May. It is headed by Canadian Member of Parliament (D.J. Rouch).

FURTHER DEATILS ON CEMA COOPERATION BOOKLET

LD070958 Moscow TASS in English 0826 GMT 7 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 7 May, TASS -- Co-operation involving joint efforts of the CMEA member countries' economic organizations in providing assistance to the developing states is the most developed form of multilateral relations between these two groups of states. Through such co-operative efforts, the CMEA member countries render assistance in carrying out about two hundred projects in developing countries, says the booklet "Co-operation of the CMEA Member Countries and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance With the Developing States" issued by the CMEA secretariat this year.

Co-operative endeavours of the economic organizations in the countries of the socialist community increasingly reflect the processes of international specialization and co-production occurring in the community of the CMEA member countries under the impact of co-operation and the socialist economic integration. Under such conditions, co-production gradually becomes a permanent feature and assumes a certain degree of specialization of the socialist countries' organizations in their multifaceted relations with the developing countries.

For example, economic organizations of Czechoslovakia and the GDR participate, on the basis of co-operation, in the design and deliveries of certain types of equipment for the metallurgical works under construction in India, Iran, Pakistan and Turkey (with the technical assistance of the Soviet Union) within the framework of specialization and co-production established among the CEMA member countries. The USSR organizations co-operated with their counterpart in Romania and Czechoslovakia in building the oil refineries in India and Turkey. The construction of cement plants in Syria with the aggregate annual capacity of 1.3 million tons per year (with the assistance of the GDR) involved, on the basis of co-operation, the deliveries of some technological equipment from Czechoslovakia and the USSR whereas the installation operations were carried out with the participation of experts from Bulgaria, etc.

The joint efforts of the CMEA members countries; organizations and of the developing countries on the markets of the third countries or in rendering assistance to another developing country constitute a new form of co-operation. Very often this form of co-operation emerges as a result of the CMEA member countries' technical assistance in building industrial enterprises and other projects in the developing countries.

Of late a number of developing countries have become participants in this multilateral form of co-operation.

Tripartite co-operation involving partners from among the CEMA member countries, developing states and developed capitalist countries is a form of multilateral relations. At present, there are over 200 projects of tripartite industrial co-operation with the involvement of practically all CEMA member countries.

The economic organizations of the CEMA member countries, while co-operating with capitalist firms, are guided by the general principles of co-operation with the developing countries, excluding thus the possibility of its utilization to the detriment of the partners from the developing countries, writes the booklet "Co-operation of the CMEA Member Countries and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance With the Developing States."

NATO PAMPHLET 'ESTIMATES' BALANCE OF FORCES

LD061744 Moscow TASS in English 1656 GMT 6 May 82

["Luns Overdoing Things" -- TASS headline; by TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow, 6 May, TASS -- The governing bodies of NATO are now in a series of sessions in Brussels. According to the Western press, the U.S. delegates there have been strictly instructed to get their West European allies to pledge a four-percent annual increase in military spending (taking inflation into account).

In the run-up to NATO's spring session, Washington had launched a new propaganda campaign about a "mythical Soviet threat." The WALL STREET JOURNAL reported, for example, that the Reagan administration's representatives had demanded that the NATO leadership publish official estimates of the military balance to ensure support for growing military spending on the part of the Western public.

No special foresight is needed to guess what kind of estimates Washington sought.

It should be noted that NATO Secretary-General Luns eagerly responded to Washington's demands and set the tone for speeches at a defence ministers' meeting of European NATO countries. He pompously announced the publication of a pamphlet about the balance of forces between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty.

Luns said the thick paper had taken more than six months of intensive work, although it contained no argument or analysis.

Even a brief examination of the document, if it may be termed like this, shows that its authors have never taken the trouble to examine the true balance of forces and have concentrated on figure manipulating techniques in an effort to confuse at least the most naive readers.

Comparison of the two sides' armed forces is a very complicated task for qualified and honest experts. But when prejudiced manipulators undertake to assess the balance of forces, everything becomes much simpler -- what they have to do is to diminish some things and exaggerate others, to include some facts and drop or reshuffle others.

This is how the authors of the NATO pamphlet have worked.

For example, they arbitrarily exclude from the military balance the NATO forces stationed in the United States, Britain, Canada and France. The pamphlet's authors deliberately ignore whole categories of European NATO countries' armed forces and armaments because, in Luns's words, they are allegedly not intended for performing the tasks of the North Atlantic alliance. As a result of these techniques, the numeric strength of NATO's regular forces has been brought down from 4,933,000 to 2,600,000. And the strength of the Warsaw Treaty regular forces -- from 4,788,000 to 4 million.

In both cases the true data were diminished, but the manipulation has turned an insignificant superiority of NATO into a huge margin in favour of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

When presenting the pamphlet to journalists, Luns said that facts are eloquent. It seems appropriate to add that only simpletons can be confused by this kind of figure and fact manipulation.

Luns and his assistants have obviously overdone things in their effort to please their employers in Washington.

III. 7 May 82

U S S R I N T E R N A T I O N A L A F F A I R S
FALKLAND ISLANDS CRISIS

DD 1

BRITISH DEFENSE MINISTRY REPORTS PLANES MISSING

LD070528 Moscow TASS in English 0525 GMT 7 May 82

[Text] London, 7 May, TASS -- Two British Harrier fighter-bombers are reported missing. The planes were on a combat patrol mission in the so-called "war zone" round the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. This has been reported by the British Defence Ministry.

According to the PRESS ASSOCIATION, the pilots of the planes must be dead since the Harriers' flight time was over and they had no fuel left.

CEASE-FIRE 'ESSENTIAL' FOR PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

Argentine 'Condition'

LD060900 Moscow TASS in English 0850 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Buenos Aires, 6 May, TASS -- Argentina has reaffirmed its readiness to search ways for the peaceful settlement of the conflict over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. It is pointed out in a governmental statement that one essential condition of this is immediate cease-fire in the area of the archipelago. Argentina also has a favourable view of the possibility of the United Nations' participation in the peaceful settlement of the British-Argentine crisis.

According to official reports, the past 24 hours on the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands were calm and there were no combat operations. The local garrison remains on the alert.

The first large group of the rescued crew members of the cruiser General Belgrano have been brought to the naval base at Bahia Blanca. The cruiser was torpedoed by a British submarine off the Estados Island on May 2.

Nott: Argentines Must Withdraw

LD062252 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Brussels, 6 May, TASS -- British Defense Secretary John Nott showed again recalcitrance of the British Government's stand on the matter of settlement of the Falkland crisis. The British defense secretary said here today he believes there can be no ceasefire until the Argentine troops are withdrawn from the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands.

John Nott spoke at a press conference in Brussels, where he arrived for a meeting of defense ministers of NATO countries. He asserted that a return of Argentine ships to ports will be the best guarantee of the ending of hostilities.

The statement of the British defense secretary also indicates that NATO intends to take advantage of the events in the South Atlantic to widen the activity of the bloc. John Nott said that allies in NATO having expressed a firm support for Britain in the conflict get convinced ever more that the West's interests are not limited to the zone of the North Atlantic bloc.

It is said here that the United States is rendering the biggest support to Britain. U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger said earlier that the United States is prepared to help Britain in operations planning, in logistic support and also to enable Britain to use wider the military base on the Ascension Island.

Thatcher Statements

LD062246 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] London, 6 May, TASS -- While talking about the readiness to press the settlement of the Falkland conflict by talks, the British Conservative Government persists with its tough line and stakes on military force.

Answering questions in the House of Commons, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher said today that Britain agrees with the ideas advanced by the United Nations secretary general as the basis for working out of proposals for the solution of the crisis. But she said Britain will not stop combat operations in the South Atlantic until the Argentine forces leave the islands.

MAJOR SHOWDOWN 'IMMINENT' IN SOUTH ATLANTIC

LD070114 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 6 May 82

[Commentary by observer Oleg Anichkin]

[Text] For all the worldwide concern over the conflict, both by the United Nations Security Council and by the world community as a whole, London is pushing ahead with its show of strength. It's making fresh threats. The Argentine Government has favorably received the initiative by the United Nations secretary general and pledges its readiness for a diplomatic solution to the issue, but London has other intentions. It's building up its forces in the South Atlantic. London papers, quoting informed sources, say the invasion is imminent. It's only a matter of time.

In point of fact, London flouts the universal demand for a negotiated settlement of the issue, that it be solved peacefully. The reason is that the United States has unequivocally sided with its NATO ally, throwing off the guise of the peacemaker and mediator. From the very start of Alexander Haig's self-styled mediation mission, it was clear what was bound to happen and it happened. For some time, the United States didn't lay its cards on the table, that is, it tried to assist its major ally in NATO and at the same time save face in Latin America, to retain positions there or maybe even derive some fresh benefits from the volatile situation. But now it's clear as day that Washington was playing a double-crossing game. The 11-day-long mediation mission of the United States secretary of state was geared to enable Britain to take its fleet to the Falklands and make ready for landing troops there and starting hostilities. The American mediation was stopped just before the British landed on South Georgia island. The United States decided that in this particular case, Atlantic solidarity should come first.

But it was only recently that the Americans said they understood Argentine problems and voiced their sympathy for the Argentinians. Yet things now are quite different. Washington is now to apply economic and other sanctions against Argentina. The White House is reportedly deciding on rendering material support to the British forces in the South Atlantic. The Pentagon is making crash plans to supply the British Navy with war material. S-141 and S-5 [as heard] Galaxy transport aircraft are to be used, as well as the naval vessels engaged in a military exercise in the Caribbean now.

So Washington lends Britain a helping hand in unleashing a war against Argentina. Threats, blackmail and force are being used along with other methods akin to the times of colonial brigandage. A major showdown is growing imminent in the South Atlantic. The conflict has occurred because the process of decolonization demanded by the United Nations was stalled. The conflict has occurred because there are interests that would like to restore positions of domination and impose on the nations an alien yoke. The dispute should be solved by peaceful means, without resorting to force. Such is the Soviet stand and such is the stand taken by the world community.

IRELAND RAPS 'DISCRIMINATORY' EEC SANCTIONS

LD070708 Moscow TASS in English 0635 GMT 7 May 82

[Text] Dublin, 7 May, TASS -- Charles Haughey, prime minister of Ireland, has criticized the discriminatory economic measures taken by the EEC against Argentina under British pressure. Outlining his country's stand on this question, he said that the situation had changed drastically since the adoption of the decision on sanctions. In his opinion, now these sanctions, contrary to further efforts to achieve diplomatic settlement of the conflict, are actually an approval of the military operations (of Britain).

Political analysts point out that Charles Haughey's statements express the opinion of influential political circles of the "Ten" which believe that open support of Britain by the EEC gives it a free hand for further escalating military operations in the South Atlantic and serves only to aggravate tension in connection with the conflict over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

NATO PLANNING GROUP MEETS; DISCUSSES FALKLANDS

LD061422 Moscow TASS in English 1403 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Brussels, 6 May, TASS -- A two-day session of the Military Planning Committee of the North-Atlantic bloc opened at the NATO headquarters in Brussels today. The defence minister of 14 NATO member countries (without France) are discussing questions of further build-up of nuclear and conventional armaments and also the annual rise in military budgets, on which Washington particularly insists. The NATO leadership prepared for the session a special report which contains the demand that military expenditures of the NATO-member countries should increase in a year by no less than 4 percent in real terms.

The armed conflict between Britain, a NATO member, and Argentina in the area of Falkland (Malvinas) Islands became a subject of discussion at yesterday's meeting of the NATO Euro-group and at the session of the Military Planning Committee. Britain's policy in South Atlantic is backed by far from all West-European partners of London in the bloc. Italy and Portugal display a particular restraint in this respect, the BELGA news agency points out.

USSR AFRO-ASIAN COMMITTEE ISSUES STATEMENT

LD061626 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 6 May, TASS -- The Soviet public follows with profound concern the development of the Anglo-Argentine conflict, which reflects the desire of imperialist powers to continue their traditional colonial policy towards developing countries. The point is stressed in a statement issued by the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee. Great Britain, patronized by the United States, is trying by blackmail and threats to retain the remnants of its one-time colonial empire and does not stop short of using weapons. The British Government intends to teach a lesson, on the example of Argentina, to other nations that come out in favour of removing British colonial enclaves and military bases from their territories, the Soviet Afro-Asian solidarity committee says.

The aggressiveness of the Tory Government, the statement of the Soviet public organisation goes on to say, is being encouraged by the open support it receives from the Reagan administration. The militaristic course of the United States and its NATO allies has already seriously worsened the international situation. It increases the war danger and contributes to the emergence and aggravation of tension in various parts of the world, Latin America among them.

Developments around the Anglo-Argentine conflict take off the mask from the Western statesmen who advertise themselves as supporters and allies of the developing countries, the statement says. The roots of the expansionist policy of international imperialism are being brought out in sharp relief.

Soviet people resolutely condemn imperialist policies towards Latin American countries and favour a peaceful settlement of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands conflict through negotiations and on the basis of U.N. de-colonisation decisions.

REPORTAGE ON U.S. ROLE IN FALKLANDS ISSUE

Kornilov Commentary

LD061812 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 May 82

[International affairs journalist Yuriy Kornilov commentary]

[Text] Reports on events in the South Atlantic are still being grouped under the heading "Anglo-Argentine Conflict." However, this heading no longer reflects, or at least far from fully reflects, the state of affairs. We are now talking about a conflict in which Argentina is openly opposed not only by Britain, but also by Britain's main NATO ally, the United States. U.S. actions in support of the British militarists fall into the same category as Washington's attacks on Nicaragua, its threats against Cuba and its interference in the affairs of El Salvador. These are all links in the same chain and an integral part of the global imperialist course of the United States, which is based on a reliance on force and attempts to use the big stick to reshape the map of the world, and to dictate its wishes to sovereign countries and peoples.

The UN Charter requires that all member-states of the community refrain from the threat of force or the use of force in their international relations. This stipulation is now being crudely trampled upon by those imperialist circles which, with weapons in their hands, are trying to obstruct the process of decolonization on the Falkland/Malvinas Islands. In this respect it is appropriate to recall that 5 years ago, in 1977, Britain and the United States openly opposed the adoption of a UN resolution on the conclusion of a worldwide treaty renouncing the use of force. It is also appropriate to recall that since World War II the United States has on 215 occasions unleashed armed conflicts and used or threatened to use force.

Need one point out what a serious danger to the cause of peace and security of the peoples is represented by this basically hegemonist approach to international affairs, in which force is regarded as almost a universal instrument in foreign policy? This is all the more so at present, when any hotbed of tension created by the imperialists -- whether it be in the Near East, Southwest Asia or the distant South Atlantic -- inevitably has a negative, destabilizing influence on the international situation as a whole.

As Leonid Ilich Brezhnev stressed in his speech on 4 May, the fact that dangerous complications and conflict situations occur in the Western Hemisphere is precisely due to the fact that forces exist which are trying to maintain or restore their dominating position and to foist alien oppression on peoples.

'Complicated Political Knot'

LD061718 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 5 May 82

[From "The World Today's program presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] At present many commentators in the West are discussing from all angles what the United States has lost and what it has gained by giving up its original stance of neutrality in the Anglo-Argentine conflict and openly taking Britain's side. There really is a problem here. It is precisely the existence of conflicting political interests in Washington which made the leaders there give the appearance, in the first days of the conflict, that they were avoiding direct support for either side. Britain is one of the U.S.' closest allies and its partner in the North Atlantic bloc, and Margaret Thatcher has probably shown the greatest zeal among the U.S.' Western allies in striving to agree with every word from Reagan.

In such circumstances it would seem that the Washington leadership should have had no hesitations about whose side to take from the first days of the conflict. However, the considerations which made U.S. diplomacy act circumspectly at first, and to give its British ally, at least not publicly, all the support it claimed from the very first hours of the conflict, are fairly weighty. Relations with the Latin American countries are a very important part of Washington's foreign policy course. The immense capital investments in the countries of Latin America which provide a very substantial part of the income the United States derives from abroad also require the corresponding political climate.

For many years U.S. diplomacy has spared no effort not to be seen as an exploiter in the Latin American public's eyes, but as a friend and defender. In these circumstances, open support from Washington for the British colonialists is fraught with far-reaching, long-term consequences dangerous for Washington. It would, of course, be a simplification to suppose that political relations between the various Latin American states are a picture of harmony or unity. They, too, have enough contradictions and disputed problems, but there is no doubt about the fact that Britain's military action against one of the Latin American states cannot fail to bring about a quite definite reaction from all the Latin American people, a reaction so strong that many other problems are pushed into the background.

In the present situation, Argentina can count to a greater or lesser degree on the sympathy, and in many cases the support, of Latin American countries. And in these circumstances, open support for the British Colonialists is for the United States fraught with many political difficulties in its relations with its southern neighbors, and moreover not just immediate difficulties which only show up now, during the heat of the Anglo-Argentine crisis, but of a long-term nature.

This complicated political knot was one of the important reasons why Washington tried for quite some time to be neutral, taking on the role of mediator in an attempt to achieve a peaceful resolution of the conflict. However, events took a turn so that U.S. diplomacy could no longer continue the diplomatic game indefinitely. The concealed support for London which Washington had been giving during the first days of the conflict proved eventually to be insufficient. The leaders of U.S. diplomacy had to make an open choice, stating whose side they were on without any beating about the bush, and this they did, as you know.

In resorting to military force to maintain its colonialist positions, Britain was guided not so much by the immediate value of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands for itself, as by the aspiration to put crude force up against the anti-colonial movement, to display a resolve to defend its positions by whatever means.

The United States, the chief force of contemporary neocolonialism, is today facing the same problems as Britain is facing during the Anglo-Argentine conflict, only on a considerably larger scale. The national liberation movement of peoples, unwilling to tolerate dependence on the colonialists, is posing a threat to the position of U.S. monopolies in many parts of the world. In such conditions, support for London's broad-scale military actions which attempt to preserve fragments of the British empire serves as a convenient pretext, as they say there, to teach a lesson to the Third World and all who dare throw down a challenge to the colonialists of today.

There is no doubt that the consequences of this decision by Washington will be very long-term and will be costly for those who have decided to become involved in this conflict on the side of those who consider that the best means to resolve complicated problems is the use of armoured fleets.

'Unequivocal' U.S. Backing

PM061435 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 82 p 5

[Gennadiy Vasilyev "Commentator's Column": "Dangerous Union"]

[Text] In a protest to the OAS the Argentine Government has declared that the United States has openly sided with the British aggressor in the Anglo-Argentine conflict over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands.

The conclusion now being reached with indignation inside and outside the Western Hemisphere is in no doubt. Indeed, having abandoned its last attempts to mask itself behind "neutrality," Washington has begun openly supporting London, which is trying to restore its colonial positions in the South Atlantic with the help of force.

The provisions of the UN Charter and the Security Council decision urging a peaceful settlement of the conflict have been forgotten. The thud of British bombs exploding on the islands echoes on the banks of the Potomac and the Thames. The problem can be settled only after "blood has been shed," America's New York TIMES writes, citing military men and diplomats. "Last week's appeal by UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar to both sides to cease hostilities," Britain's THE OBSERVER reports, "infuriated M. Thatcher." It is clear to everyone that the British Tories can act so provocatively only because they are backed by their senior partner in the aggressive imperialist NATO bloc.

Washington is now supporting Britain not only in the political and diplomatic sphere by putting pressure on Argentina. Following the EEC countries, the United States has joined in the trade and economic sanctions against Argentina and, most importantly, is already giving military support -- at present, primarily material and technical support -- for the armed actions of the British naval armada, placing its own bases and transport aircraft at its disposal and providing intelligence information. British Foreign Secretary F. Pym, who went to Washington and U.S. Secretary of the Navy J. Lehman, who visited the banks of the Thames, are engaged in coordinating joint efforts. After its initial attempt to occupy two chairs -- NATO and pan-American -- Washington has definitely and unequivocally chosen Britain's side.

The development of events around the Anglo-Argentine conflict is stripping away the propaganda camouflage from those people in the West who pretend to champion the developing countries. The foundations of the imperialist circles' class policy and all the hypocrisy of the so-called inter-American system, which Washington remembers only when it is a question of defending the interests of American monopolies, are being revealed with great clarity. The events in the South Atlantic are revealing still more clearly the global aggressive essence of NATO.

PENTAGON SEEN AS 'EXPLOITING' FALKLANDS CONFLICT

PM061345 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 May 82 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by Yu. Bandura: "The South Atlantic: The Hidden Springs of the Conflict"]

[Text] And so the hopes for sense and restraint have not been justified. The hotbed of conflict smoldering in the South Atlantic for almost a month now is beginning to burn increasingly fiercely....

It is customary to regard this conflict as assuming specific definition 2 April, after a small assault group of Argentine Army frogmen landed on the rocky coast of the East Falkland (Soledad) Island early in the morning, about an hour before dawn. In reality the sources of the conflict are rooted 150 years ago when on 3 January 1833, the British brig Clio dislodged the Argentine garrison from this East Falkland (Soledad) Island and proclaimed this corner of the South Atlantic to be a British crown possession.

The acquisition of the new colony, however, was nothing but an act of unprovoked aggression against the young state which had arisen on the ruins of the Spanish colonial empire. This fact must be recalled for the simple reason that it is London -- the same London which 150 years ago created and retained by force, without any concern for international law, a colonial enclave on the territory of a sovereign state -- which is now going on the warpath again to seize land 12,000 km from British shores.

The conflict can and must be averted. It would be enough merely to heed the demands of the international community enshrined in the well-known UN documents on decolonization, or merely to fulfill the UN General Assembly resolution calling for the conflict to be settled at the negotiating table.

It must be said that talks have been conducted between Argentina and Britain on sovereignty over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands.

They have been conducted since 1966. But London has had no intention of bringing them to a conclusion by renouncing its colonial possession. And to confirm this, it has not stopped at military adventures. As J. Callaghan, who was British prime minister at the time, admitted recently, no longer ago than 1977 Britain was already mustering its naval forces from bases in the Caribbean and the Mediterranean to send them to the islands. Was not this show of strength a dress rehearsal for the present conflict?

At that time the aggravation of the conflict was successfully avoided. Today the clash in the region of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands has become a fait accompli. And responsibility for the emergence in the South Atlantic of a new "hot spot" on the planet does not rest solely with London: It is shared by the imperialist camp as a whole, which has resolutely adopted stances of unconditional moral and material support for M. Thatcher's Cabinet and thus encouraged London to wage a "punitive war."

The embargo which the West European countries immediately imposed on imports of Argentine goods into the EEC countries was also a demonstration of imperialist solidarity. Not satisfied with that, the West is making efforts to internationalize what was initially a bilateral conflict. Attention is drawn here to NATO's involvement in the conflict on London's side....

As long ago as 2 April this aggressive bloc which calls itself a "defensive alliance" expressed "deep concern at the conflict" over the islands, 1/2 of whose territory is designated the private property of the British Coalite company (50 percent of the islands' inhabitants work for it, incidentally). Approving in advance Britain's use of armed force to "resolve the conflict" NATO Secretary General Luns publicly stated a week later: "It would be a dangerous precedent were a NATO ally simply to tolerate the seizure of part of its territory without undertaking any military action."

The U.S. "big press" has adopted no less openly a position of encouraging London to unleash military operations against Argentina. For instance, here is one such "prompting" published in the New York TIMES: "The most obvious method which comes to mind is to prepare to storm the islands immediately; another path could be taken -- setting up a blockade of the main Argentine ports or destroying port facilities for grain exports; yet another possibility is to engage the adversary's naval and air forces and inflict sufficient damage to bring down and disgrace the military junta.... The objective is to give Argentina a mighty scare and cause it sufficient material and economic damage."

Whence this cynicism? Whence this shameless peremptoriness in deciding the fate of a country which to this day official Washington calls a "friendly state"? These questions can be answered only if you understand that the United States is under no circumstances an "honest broker" in the Anglo-Argentine conflict.

And it is not only that the Pentagon has put at the disposal of the British Armed Forces its military base on Ascension Island, without which the "punitive expedition" against Argentina would have been completely impossible. Nor is it only that the Pentagon has supplied and is continuing to supply its NATO ally with the most detailed intelligence on the preparations and movements of the Argentine troops and is supplying fuel to the British squadron and aircraft. These facts, of course, speak for themselves, just as the fact that Washington has introduced economic sanctions against Argentina speaks for itself. The main thing, however, is that this conflict is essentially a conflict between the United States and Argentina to the same if not a greater degree than it is an Anglo-Argentine conflict. And in the situation taking shape around the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands London is not so much "defending Britain's honor and sovereignty" as ensuring Washington's long-term strategic interests.

In May 1980, even before R. Reagan came to power, the incumbent president's advisers on Latin American affairs had prepared the so-called "Santa Fe document" which asserted: "Latin America, like West Europe and Japan, is one of the foundations of U.S. power. We must not allow the loss of any of the foundations of U.S. global power in Latin America, West Europe or the western Pacific if the United States wants to retain an adequate superiority of forces."

At the time, just 2 years ago, the strategists from R. Reagan's "think tank" still hoped to secure their "global power" in Central and South America through the OAS' gradual transformation into a bloc with military-political functions. At the same time it was proposed, with a view to securing U.S. hegemonism in the South Atlantic, to knock together another political bloc -- SATO -- including the racist Republic of South Africa, Pinochet's Chile and a number of other pro-U.S. regimes along with Brazil and Argentina.

However, these plans were not destined to be realized. The majority of Latin American states rejects the U.S. "big stick" policy. And Brazil and Argentina also firmly rejected the idea of creating a South Atlantic double for NATO. If we add to this the stepping up of the broad masses' struggle against pro-U.S. despotic regimes in the Caribbean zone of Latin America, the weakening of U.S. "strategic control" over the Panama Canal Zone and the Latin American countries' growing reluctance to identify their foreign policy course with Washington's "global" one, then it is not difficult to understand that the plans outlined in the "Santa Fe document" fall apart at the seams.

It is under these conditions that the Pentagon is showing increasing interest in the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, which as long ago as 1765 the British admiralty proclaimed "the key to the entire Pacific" and which confirmed their strategic significance in December 1914 when a British squadron from its base on these islands intercepted and destroyed a group of German naval vessels proceeding from the Pacific to the shores of Europe. And the Pentagon devotes no less serious attention to the island of South Georgia, which, according to London's DAILY MAIL, "is of greater strategic importance than the Falkland Islands, since it is the gateway to Antarctica."

However, much the White House might try to conceal its designs on these islands, it exposed them when Secretary of State A. Haig suggested raising both the Argentine Flag and the British flag over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands on condition that the U.S. Stars and Stripes fly between them. However, the U.S. intentions were known even before these events. And Washington's subsequent actions have merely confirmed the conclusion which the newspaper CORREIO BRASILIENSE reached back at the end of March: "The United States is trying to use the dispute between Argentina and Britain to strengthen its positions in the South Atlantic. The Pentagon is no stranger to the idea of creating its own military base on the Falklands by exploiting the confrontation between the two countries for that purpose."

And it is clear how this confrontation is being exploited. Buenos Aires showed no desire to meet halfway Washington's solicitations on either the SATO issue or the question of sovereignty over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. But London granted the Pentagon the right to create a military base on Ascension Island, situated in the middle of the Atlantic, and handed over Diego Garcia island, which had been wrested from Mauritius, to the United States for a strategic base in the Indian Ocean. And so Washington is confident that, if Britain succeeds in wresting the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands once again from Argentina, London will readily "cede" them to the Pentagon. All the more so as, according to a comment in the GUARDIAN, Britain has no "strategic interests" of its own there, as distinct from U.S. ones.

Washington tried for 3 weeks to ensure its "freedom of action" in the South Atlantic in the process of offering the "peaceful services" of Secretary of State Haig. But when it came to light that Buenos Aires would not agree to a deal on Washington's and London's terms, the British squadron, which had taken up attack positions near the islands, was loosed from its chain. The conflict escalated into an armed clash. And it is becoming a new front in the international community's struggle against recurrences of imperialist hegemonism and for the completion of the decolonization process.

LATEST DEVELOPMENTS IN FALKLANDS CRISIS REVIEWED

LD061530 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Buenos Aires, 6 May, TASS -- The Argentine Government has released a communique reaffirming its desire to conduct negotiations to achieve a peaceful settlement of the problem of the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands, the South Georgia island and the South Sandwich Islands. The first step toward the settlement of the conflict should be an immediate cease-fire, the communique says. Argentina accepts U.N. mediation with the participation of the U.N. secretary general, the Security Council or both because it believes this mediation to be particularly suitable at the present moment.

Meanwhile, no combat operations are conducted on the islands themselves.

The first large group of rescued crew members from the cruiser General Belgrano have been brought to the naval base, Bahia Blanca. Almost 800 out of the more than 1,000 crew members have been rescued by now.

The Argentine mass media strongly criticise the role of an accomplice assumed by the U.S. administration in the British-Argentine conflict. The newspaper Buenos Aires HERALD calls the Reagan administration a "traitor" and stresses that Washington bears a good deal of responsibility for London's armed venture in the southern Atlantic.

London, 6 May, TASS -- Despite large losses suffered by both sides involved in the British-Argentine conflict, the Thatcher Conservative Cabinet persists in its striving to settle the conflict by armed force.

As British Defence Secretary John Nott said in Parliament, the British naval task force operating in the southern Atlantic would continue performing its tasks. The statement of British Foreign Secretary Francis Pym in the House of Commons also testifies to Britain's unwillingness to renounce its "tough" stand. He confirmed that Britain would not agree to a cease-fire in the conflict without a rapid withdrawal of Argentine troops from the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands. Pym said he was busy studying the ideas suggested by U.S. Secretary of State Haig. It is common knowledge that all the earlier "initiatives" of the chief of the U.S. diplomatic community were a complete failure because from the outset American "diplomatic mediation" was merely a cover for direct military cooperation between the United States and Britain.

The TIMES writes that Britain believes Haig's role to be absolutely essential in any settlement but, according to statements made in the Argentine circles, the latter has completely discredited himself by having taken Britain's side.

Holding a "hawkish stance," the British Government is aware of the undivided support of Washington and NATO's militarist circles. According to news agencies, U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger said in Brussels that NATO's support for Britain had not diminished.

At present spokesman for the United States and some of its NATO allies have begun to make statements on the desirability of conducting peace talks between Argentina and Britain. Meanwhile, according to the press, it is the United States and its allies, which agreed within EEC to impose sanctions against Argentina and which voiced solidarity with British aggressive policy, that pushed London into starting operations which resulted in bloodshed. Recalling this fact, the press characterises this attitude of the NATO powers as irresponsible.

IZVESTIYA HITS ROGERS CALL FOR WIDER NATO ACTION

PM061439 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 82 Morning Edition p 5

[Unattributed "rejoinder" from V. Tarasov roundup "The World Today": "Rogers 'Crosses the Borders'"]

[Text] It is no secret that Washington has long been trying to involve the NATO allies in the implementation of its own global imperialist designs. Nonetheless Washington, like the other allied capitals, has refrained from talking openly about this. But now Rogers, supreme commander NATO Allied Forces Europe, has decided not to stand on ceremony. On an official visit to Portugal, he convened a press conference and publicly expounded the Pentagon's intentions as regards utilizing its allies.

He proclaimed the priority task for bloc members to be the elaboration of a "program for reaction"... outside NATO's geographical borders. In other words, the general proposes that the West Europeans share with the Americans the functions of world gendarme and participate in interference in the internal affairs even of those countries and peoples which are geographically thousands of kilometers outside the NATO zone. There is not enough room for the American general within Europe. He wants to cross all the borders and to entice all his allies in the NATO military bloc into this dangerous adventure.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: U.S. HARBORS NAZI WAR CRIMINALS

LD070826 Moscow TASS in English 0806 GMT 7 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 7 May, TASS -- Facts show, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes today, that the United States "openly violates international agreements between the nations which fought against Nazi Germany, signed by the United States as well. Under these agreements, war criminals should be handed over for a trial and punishment to countries where they committed their crimes. As a result of Washington's 'special policy', however," the newspaper points out, "the United States was transformed immediately after the end of the war into a virtual 'promised land' for thousands of Nazis and traitors who acted under their leadership, becoming the third country after West Germany and Argentina by the number of sheltered war criminals, the criminals who are wanted by the Governments of the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Romania, the German Democratic Republic, Italy, Denmark, the Netherlands, France and Belgium, as was admitted by the American press."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes that according to American press reports, "about 3,000 Nazi war criminals, responsible for the death of two million people, are hiding in U.S. territory."

According to prominent American publicist Charles Allen, the American authorities not only knew about the criminal past of the war criminals, but also shamelessly used their services. He indicated that at least 149 former Nazis received cushy jobs in 12 U.S. Government institutions, including the Department of State, the Pentagon, the CIA, the FBI and Radios Liberty and Free Europe. It is no accident that when Laipenieks (resident of San Diego, California), a criminal who took part in the murder in Riga of about 12,000 people during the war, went on trial, the CIA intervened and the case was dropped. It turned out that the murderer worked for the American espionage agency in the sixties. And he is far from being the only one. Many fugitive Nazis became CIA consultants on "Soviet problems". Their "experience" was used for staging subversive actions against the USSR and other socialist countries.

PRAVDA ARTICLE EXAMINES U.S. 'PSYCHOLOGICAL WAR'

LD070624 Moscow TASS in English 0608 GMT 7 May 82

["Yuriy Zhukov: Washington's Big Lie" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 7 May, TASS -- It is probably never before that the ruling clique in the United States and NATO, intimidated by the rapid growth of the anti-war struggle, resorted to so primitive and really base tricks in their "psychological war" against socialist countries, against the peoples heroically struggling for their freedom and peace, writes PRAVDA's political news analyst Yuriy Zhukov. He stresses that this "psychological war" started neither today nor yesterday. Hardly had the artillery barrage of the last battles of World War II died away, when U.S. Congress adopted several decisions on establishing a powerful propaganda apparatus designed to become a major tool in the ambitious policy aimed at "rolling back" communism and gaining world supremacy for the United States.

The "psychological war" in our time is not limited to that, the writer points out. "Since the public is increasingly more watchful and critical of the mendacious reports in the bourgeois press, the wildest anti-Soviet fabrications are being made more and more often not only by the irresponsible bodies of the press, radio and television, but also by official government bodies in the United States -- the State Department, the Pentagon, the Central Intelligence Agency and the office of the country's President."

The article points out that mendacious reports used by the American leadership as a political tool encounter increasingly greater mistrust outside the United States, including in the allied countries. "Neither Washington nor London, however, intend to renounce the 'psychological war.' Wick's agency will spend in the current fiscal year 489 million dollars to spread its mendacious propaganda, and has already demanded 640 million for the next year."

The Soviet people are not inclined to overestimate or underestimate the intentions and designs of the organisers of the "psychological war," the writer concludes. "It is common knowledge that antagonism between the communist and bourgeois outlooks reflects an objective historical process underlying which is the class struggle. This antagonism is inevitable, but it is one thing when the point at issue is the struggle of ideas, and quite another are the actions of our opponents who have no ideals capable of attracting millions of people."

BUSH MISSION: PRC CONCESSIONS ON TAIWAN

PM071031 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 May 82 Morning Edition p 4

[S. Agafonov "International Commentary": "One More Compromise?"]

[Text] A visit to China was not initially part of the official program for U.S. Vice President G. Bush's tour. However, aggravation of U.S.-Chinese contradictions on the Taiwan issue required personal intervention at a high level. As is well known, in mid-May the U.S. Congress is to reply to an administration request to grant Taipei a \$60 million consignment of spare parts and military equipment. The White House's latest pro-Taiwan demarche has given rise to a storm of indignation in Beijing. On the eve of G. Bush's arrival RENMIN RIBAO stated that the U.S.-Chinese talks on U.S. arms sales to Taiwan which have been underway since November last year have reached a deadlock and that there is a crisis situation in bilateral relations.

Let us note that outbreaks of tension have become a characteristic phenomenon in contacts between the United States and China since the establishment of diplomatic relations in 1979. On at least three occasions in the past 6 months alone serious diplomatic disputes have risen on the most diverse subjects -- from U.S.-Taiwan military contacts to the publication in the United States of atlases depicting Taiwan as an independent country. U.S.-Chinese relations at the present stage are thus a succession of conflicts great and small.

At the same time -- parallel, as it were, to this trend -- there is another avenue in bilateral relations. At different levels both Washington and Beijing are emphasizing their mutual desire to develop and expand contacts and are pointing to the "strategic importance" of mutual rapprochement. Despite the diplomatic skirmish, trade and scientific and technical cooperation are growing and relations in the military sphere, including the exchange of intelligence, are developing.

The impression is formed that the keen debate over U.S.-Chinese differences, particularly on the Taiwan question, are taking their own course, while direct collaboration in the political, economic and other spheres is doing the same.

In the development of relations between Washington and Beijing a compromise on the Taiwan problem, which directly affects China's national interests, plays an extremely important part. However, this compromise is essentially one-sided. While officially stating that diplomatic relations with Taiwan have been broken off, the United States has in fact left untouched the entire complex of Washington-Taipai contacts.

The law on the new relations with Taiwan passed by the U.S. Congress in April 1979 secured the extension of about 60 U.S.-Taiwan treaties and agreements. Reciprocal trade in flourishing and the Pentagon's output, within the framework of a 5-year agreement, is continuing to flow to the island uninterrupted. Essentially the entire process of "bridgebuilding" between the United States and China -- and Washington states this openly -- has proceeded on the basis of the "two Chinas" concept. The elaboration of a mutually acceptable platform during the regulations of relations basically amounted to Beijing's tacit recognition of U.S. interests in Taiwan and the attainment of guarantees that these interests would be preserved in the future. The compromise thus did not represent the equitable actions of both sides but the unilateral transformation of Beijing's position on the Taiwan issue which the United States made a condition of its aid to China.

"As ye sow so shall ye reap." people say. And although Beijing is now rightly noting the contradictory nature of Washington's actions with respect to Taiwan and is pointing to actual U.S. interference in the PRC's internal affairs and the Americans' violation of China's sovereignty, at the same time the Chinese press and official representatives are obliged to keep quiet about the real reasons for the prevailing situation, which was the result of the Chinese ruling clique's "pragmatic approach." It is hard to say how serious the result of the latest flareup of contradictions caused by the Taiwan problem will be for U.S.-Chinese relations. In this connection attention is drawn by official Washington's optimism. Thus U.S. Vice President G. Bush, even before it was decided that he would visit China, spoke during his stay in Tokyo of the U.S. administration's confidence that relations with China would be preserved at their present level. Is this not a hope of another compromise, or to be more precise a new concession, by the Beijing leadership?

That is the state of affairs on the eve of the talks. Time will tell whether Bush's mission is successful. We can merely note very definitely that Washington is continuing to play the "Taiwan card" in its relations with Beijing, ignoring China's national interests, undermining the leadership's political prestige and attempting to impose on it the role of junior partner in the U.S.-Chinese dialogue.

VINOGRADOV VIEWS JAPAN-U.S. SECURITY TREATY

PMO61417 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Apr 82 p 3

[V. Vinogradov military-political commentary: "To Washington's Tune"]

[Text] It has been 30 years since the Japanese-American "security treaty" came into force, under cover of which the Pentagon turned Japan into its private estate. In 1960 this treaty was reviewed and it is still in force.

Having amended -- under pressure from Washington -- the peace clauses of the Constitution that prevented Japan from maintaining armed forces and waging war, the Japanese ruling circles are stepping up militarist preparations at an intensified pace. Japan's National Defense Agency has completed the elaboration of a new 5-year program for modernization of the country's armed forces for 1983-1987. Taking account of Washington's demands, it envisages equipping all categories of the "Self-Defense Forces" with the latest offensive weapons. For these purposes alone the leadership of the military department is demanding an allocating of 5 trillion yen. According to the drafts the overall cost of the whole program, including spending on maintaining the armed forces over these 5 years, will exceed 20 trillion yen.

Washington's influence on the Japanese compilers of this program document is felt throughout. The modernization of the country's air force is envisaged with a view to enabling it to "defend maritime communications in the western Pacific." For this purpose the number of Navy P-3C Orion antisubmarine aircraft will be increased to 80 and the number of warships, including missile carriers, will be increased to 62. By 1987 Japan's Air Force will have 155 of the latest F-15 Eagle fighters and several AWACS aircraft in its armory.

There is another fact which demonstrates that the compilers of the latest Japanese "5-year militarization plan" were obviously dancing to Washington's tune: Under this program special attention will be paid to strengthening "defense capability in northern Japan." This applies primarily to Hokkaido Island, which is the closest in the Japanese archipelago to Soviet shores.

As the newspaper NIHON KEIZAI reported, during a meeting with Japan's Premier Z. Suzuki the National Defense Agency leadership presented their "creation" to him and enlisted his support for their overtly militarist plans. These plans include the expansion and acceleration of military preparations in the country, the activation of joint Japanese-American military maneuvers and completion of the preparation of combat operation plans in case of "crisis situations."

As is known, Japan's Air Force and Navy already regularly hold joint militarist demonstrations using the arena of Japanese airspace and coastal waters. An intensive program is now planned for the ground forces too. Such exercises have already taken place on the slopes of Fujiyama, and command staff exercises are planned for August in the Hawaiian Islands, November on the Higashifuji firing range in Shizuoka Prefecture and December on Hokkaido Island.

It is indicative that all this militarist racket is accompanied by an unbridled anti-Soviet ballyhoo and calls to "be ready" to repel the so-called "threat from the north." The forced and absurd nature of such assertions is being exposed by the Japanese themselves. Thus the latest issue of the influential Tokyo magazine JAPAN QUARTERLY carried an article by former high-ranking employee of Japan Defense Agency Lt. (Maeda). Revealing the real state of affairs behind the campaign raised by the Reagan administration and supported by certain circles in Japan on the so-called "Soviet military threat," he writes that they needed this in order to increase military spending. The main danger to Japan, Lt. (Maeda) stresses, lies primarily in the Japanese-American "security treaty," on the basis of which its territory is enmeshed in network of U.S. bases. In modern conditions, the article's author concludes, Japan has absolutely no need of this treaty.

Without any doubt it is primarily the United States, which sees Japan as an important strategic bridgehead in its global policy, that is interested in this treaty. The very readiness of the Japanese Government to dance to Washington's tune, that is, to follow in the wake of its dangerous course, is a real threat to Japan's own national interests.

USSR-DPRK TRADE ACCORD FOR 1982 SIGNED IN MOSCOW

SK070624 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1130 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Talks between the Soviet Union and the DPRK concluded in Moscow on 5 May after discussing matters concerning the mutual shipment of commercial goods in 1982 between two countries in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding. At these talks a protocol for the exchange of commercial goods between the Soviet Union and the DPRK in 1982 was signed. The protocol envisages expansion of mutual exchange of commercial goods.

As usual, the Soviet Union will ship machines, equipment, transportation gears and other raw materials to the DPRK. In return the DPRK will ship ferrous metal, rolled metal, zinc, silver, powdered magnesium, nonmetallic minerals, cement, clothes, nitrogen, fruits and other consumer goods to the Soviet Union.

The protocol was signed by Comrade Grishin, deputy minister of foreign trade, on the Soviet side and by Comrade Pang Tae-yul, deputy minister of foreign trade, on the DPRK side. Participating in this occasion was Comrade Kim Si-pong, DPRK charge d'affaires to the Soviet Union.

FILATOV ARTICLE ON DPRK ARMY ANNIVERSARY

PM061137 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 25 April publishes on page 3 under the headline "The Republic's Reliable Shield, Today Is the 50th Anniversary of the Korean People's Army" a 1,600-word Pyongyang-Moscow report by special correspondent Col V. Filatov pegged to the 50th anniversary of the DPRK army, describing its past and present against the background of an account of meetings with servicemen of the DPRK Air Force, Artillery Forces and Ground Forces. The report includes some of their reminiscences of the Korean War and quotes one DPRK serviceman as saying that "Soviet servicemen's exploits have always inspired and continue to inspire all Korean soldiers and officers to new achievements in combat and political training."

USTINOV RECEIVES MONGOLIAN DEFENSE MINISTER

PM280919 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Apr 82 p 1

[Unattributed report: "A Friendly Conversation"]

[Text] On 21 April Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Minister of Defense, received Col Gen J. Abhia, Mongolian minister of defense, who had stopped over in the Soviet Union on his way home.

There was a warm and friendly conversation during which they discussed questions of mutual interest.

Participating in the conversation were Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov, chief of the General Staff and USSR first deputy minister of defense; Army Gen S.S. Kurkotkin, USSR deputy minister of defense; Col Gen Engr M.A. Sergeychik; and Adm A.I. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

The meeting was attended by D. Gotob, Mongolian ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR; Lt Gen Ch. Purebdorj, Mongolian Armed Forces chief of General Staff and Mongolian first deputy minister of defense; Maj Gen S. Gombosuren, first deputy chief of the Mongolian People's Army political directorate, and S. Gangaanyam, army and air force attache at the Mongolian Embassy in the USSR.

DRA CELEBRATES APRIL REVOLUTION ANNIVERSARY

Embassy Reception

PM061401 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 82 p 4

[Text] TASS -- Habib Mangal, DRA ambassador to the Soviet Union, held a reception on 27 April on the occasion of the fourth anniversary of the April Revolution, the national holiday. At the reception were A.F. Vatchenko, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Z.N. Nuriyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and representatives of party, soviet and public organizations.

Makeyev Return From Kabul

PM061227 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 82 p 4

[Text] TASS -- A USSR party and government delegation headed by V.N. Makeyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and member of the CPSU Central Committee, returned to Moscow from Kabul on 29 April. It had been participating in the celebration of the April Revolution's fourth anniversary at the invitation of the PDPA Central Committee and the DRA Government.

The delegation comprised V.M. Borisenkov, second secretary of the Moscow CPSU Obkom and CPSU Central Committee member; P.K. Luchinskiy, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department; and F.A. Tabeyev, USSR ambassador to the DRA and CPSU Central Committee member.

The delegation was met at the airport by K.F. Katushev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and CPSU Central Committee member; S.F. Antonov and N.N. Tarasov, who are USSR ministers and members of the CPSU Central Committee, V.N. Sevruk, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department; and other officials. H. Mangal, DRA ambassador to the USSR, was among the reception party.

DOCTOR, AGRONOMIST, TEACHER ON DRA MISSION

PM061139 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian on 2 May publishes on page 5 under the headline "On a Mission in Afghanistan" a 1,200-word article by L. Mironov and B. Tretyachenko, describing the activities of three different Soviet specialists working in the DRA -- a doctor, an agronomist and a teacher -- who are helping the Afghan people "build a new, peaceful life."

VISIT TO INDIA BY SRV FOREIGN MINISTER REVIEWED

PM061527 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 May 82 p 5

[Article by Mikhail Domogatskikh under the rubric "Our Commentaries": "Good-Will Visit"]

[Text] SRV Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach has paid a 6-day visit to India. It was the concluding stage of the tour of a number of European and Asian countries undertaken by the minister of Socialist Vietnam during which various aspects of cooperation between the SRV and these countries were discussed.

Relations of friendship and fruitful cooperation exist between Vietnam and India, two states which play a large and active part in the Nonaligned Movement and in international politics as a whole. These relations were established at the initiative of Ho Chi Minh and Jawaharlal Nehru.

The two countries' friendly relations entered a new phase after the Vietnamese people's victory in the struggle for their motherland's liberation and unification. They are becoming increasingly diverse. That is borne out by the results of Nguyen Co Thach's present visit. During meetings on Indian soil there was a discussion, in a cordial atmosphere, of the further development of international affairs.

The SRV foreign minister informed Indian Prime Minister I. Gandhi of the situation in Southeast Asia and expressed the conviction that the only way to ease tension in this region is through negotiations which take into consideration the peace proposals of the three countries of Indochina -- the SRV, Laos and Kampuchea. Addressing a press conference in Delhi, the minister stated that the normalization of the situation in Asia is being hindered by the Beijing leadership, which is trying to thwart the peaceful dialogue between the countries of Indochina and ASEAN and to create an atmosphere of confrontation and tension. Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi also expressed herself in favor of resolving all complex and contentious issues by peaceful means, through negotiations.

The Indian public assessed highly Nguyen Co Thach's call for the creation of a zone of peace and cooperation in the region consisting of the ASEAN countries and the Indochina and South Asian states and for everything to be done to eliminate tension and instability here.

The joint Vietnamese-Indian communique on the results of the SRV foreign minister's visit to India contains an appeal from the two countries to the states of Southeast Asia to begin talks immediately with a view to settling the problems existing between them. The sides note that the situation in Southeast Asia cannot be allowed to become even more heated and that only dialogue between the states of this region can lead to the establishment of peace and stability in Asia.

Nguyen Co Thach's visit to India has shown the fruitfulness of Vietnamese-Indian relations and the positive nature of their influence on the situation in the region.

Socialist Vietnam has demonstrated once again the desire to develop friendly relations and economic and cultural ties with all countries and to strengthen peace and the people's security.

BRIEFS

BRIDGE TO AFGHANISTAN -- The Soviet and Afghan banks of the Amu-Darya in the vicinity of the Uzbek town of Termez have been linked by a bridge for road and rail traffic. By normal standards it should take at least 54 months to build such a structure. The bridge builders completed this work in 30 months. The building of the friendship bridge attracted enthusiasts from many parts of the country. Representatives of more than 20 nationalities have been working on the project. The opening of the bridge will soon take place. The Soviet town of Termez and the Afghan one of Hayratan, a little higher up the river on the left bank, are preparing for this celebration.
[Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 6 May 82 LD]

'SLANDER' ON SRV WORKERS IN USSR REJECTED

PM061459 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 May 82 Morning Edition p 4

[M. Ilinskiy article: "Campaigns Based on Falsehoods: Imperialist Propaganda's Latest Fabrications"]

[Text] It is no secret that slander against the socialist community countries ranks by no means least in the arsenal of the Western mass media. But, as is well known, lies are short lived.

Remember how much fuss was made over the so-called problem of refugees from Southeast Asian countries? People tried to pin the false label of "creator of the refugee problem" on Socialist Vietnam, but without success. Imperialist circles and the forces of international reaction not only failed to achieve the goals set, but found themselves in the role of the NCO's widow [reference to Gogol story in which a widow flogs herself]. Progressive mankind once again revealed the origins of this problem. It was created by American aggression in Indochina and then aggravated by the Pentagon's subversive activity against the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea.

The turbulent wave stirred up around that problem had hardly died down when another one was created. The aggressors started making accusations of "aggression" against...Vietnam, which was giving fraternal assistance to the Khmer people, who had overthrown the bloody Pol Pot genocidal regime. This too ended in failure. The subversive aim of these operations is clear: To create and whip up distrust toward the SRV, Laos and Kampuchea and poison the political atmosphere in Southeast Asia. The intrigues of the enemies of peace and socialism were resolutely exposed. The combat solidarity of the three peoples of Indochina was tempered in the struggle and became still firmer.

But the series of defeats did not cause the political opponents of Indochina's patriots to have second thoughts. The evidence of this is provided by a new campaign. This time the Western disinformation workers, above all in the United States, decided to make an accusation against Vietnam to the effect that its troops are allegedly using "Soviet-made" chemical weapons in Laos and Kampuchea. How's that for shifting the blame onto the innocent party! After all, it is generally known that it was not Vietnam but the United States itself that committed a monstrous crime against the Vietnamese population and their environment. It was the U.S. military that scattered more than 100,000 tons of toxins and chemical warfare agents over Vietnam and caused the country tremendous damage.

This campaign had not had time to die down when new antisocialist fabrications were splashed across the pages of the Western press. The socialist community countries' economic progress, their strengthening cooperation, their mutual assistance to each other and their selfless, fraternal support for heroic Vietnam, which suffered in so many wars against foreign aggressors, stick in some people's throats. So yet another falsehood has emerged in the West. Expatiating on human rights, the bourgeois press has started to fuss over the "sending of Vietnamese workers to the USSR." Certain circles are even not above putting forward this "question" for discussion in international organizations.

At press conferences during SRV Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach's recent tour of West European countries some people even tried to slip in the provocative thesis that Vietnam, "being in debt to the Soviet Union, is supplying it with manpower, which the USSR uses in Siberia"(?!).

The minister gave a fitting rebuff to the slanderers from among bourgeois journalists and at the same time explained that the Soviet Union's support is full of the spirit of internationalism and fraternal solidarity. Unlike Western countries, after the end of the American aggression the USSR wrote off Vietnam's debt arising from credits granted earlier.

The sending of Vietnamese citizens to the USSR for vocational training and work is another form of the Soviet Union's assistance to Socialist Vietnam in the training of highly skilled working class cadres. The status of Vietnamese citizens in the Soviet Union for vocational training and work is governed by an intergovernmental agreement between the USSR and the SRV signed 2 April 1981. Under this agreement Vietnamese citizens are guaranteed all the rights and freedoms envisaged by Soviet laws. The situation of Vietnamese workers in the USSR differs radically from the oppressed position of foreign workers in capitalist countries, who are deprived of their rights. Vietnamese citizens are in a position of full equality with Soviet workers.

But the bourgeois propaganda machine continues to turn. First this "theme" was taken up and embellished by all kinds of "gutter press" organs. But recently, evidently not without the participation of certain circles, reputable press organs have joined in this campaign, though it does not behoove them to publish unverified reports. In particular, items clearly based on falsehoods have appeared in Paris' LE MONDE, Japan's YOMIURI, America's WALL STREET JOURNAL and a number of other bourgeois newspapers, as well as the Beijing press.

But the apologists of the bourgeoisie will not succeed in discrediting the relations of friendship and mutual assistance between socialist countries and the cooperation between the Soviet and Vietnamese people by means of this latest slander campaign. The spirit and the letter of that intergovernmental agreement indicate above all that the Soviet people, in helping Vietnam by training national cadres, regard this sphere of cooperation as the fulfillment of their international duty. All the training of highly skilled workers is associated with and based on the interests of the SRV's economic development.

Last, a word about some of the facts which the authors of the bourgeois press falsifications so clumsily distort. First, they are evidently not well up in geography. The Vietnamese citizens in the USSR under the agreement undergo training and work not in remote regions of Siberia but in the regions that are most favorable to them in terms of climatic conditions -- in particular, as the Soviet press has written more than once, in Krasnodar, Astrakhan, Volgograd, Donetsk, Kursk and Dzhambul and beyond the Urals, in Kemerovskaya Oblast and Altayskiy Kray (let us observe that melons and watermelons ripen excellently there).

Apart from their poor knowledge of geography, the authors of the insinuations have shown that they are not well up in arithmetic either. They seek to convince their readers that hundreds of thousands of young people are being shipped out of Vietnam, while it is only a question of some 7,000 Vietnamese citizens who have come to the USSR for vocational training.

And now, how do the Vietnamese citizens in the Soviet Union receive their vocational training, how do they live and in what sectors do they work? On their behalf, Comrades Nguyen (Shin Tyu) and (Khoang An Tuan) told me that under the agreement Vietnamese citizens aged between 17 and 35 are given free vocational training and language teaching in the Soviet Union. They have free use of all the necessary textbooks, dictionaries, reference works and other tools. From the day he crosses the Soviet border and throughout his period of training, which can be up to 1 year, the Vietnamese citizen is paid wages at 100 percent of the wage rate for a worker on time rate in the first wage category of the profession concerned. Vietnamese citizens aged 18 and over are permitted to work at enterprises. They are being trained and are working in more than 50 basic vocations, which require high skills in leading sectors of industry. The training of highly skilled worker cadres for precisely these sectors is particularly important for the SRV economy, and therefore the necessary vocations are specially stipulated by the two sides.

Each Vietnamese citizen arriving in the USSR under the above agreement (the passage is paid for at both ends by the Soviet side) is issued with free equipment (winter and summer clothing) and is also granted a financial loan on request.

Soviet citizens devote great attention, (Tyu) went on, to organizing the Vietnamese citizens' life. They are provided with well-appointed housing and canteens. The young Vietnamese men and women are surrounded with warmth and concern by the leadership of Soviet enterprises and organization and live in one big, harmonious collective with USSR workers.

Particular mention should be made, he stressed, of the great work done by Soviet health care organs, the network of clinics and medical establishments and their personnel. Our workers are provided with protective clothing at enterprises.

Various cultural and mass events and excursions are organized for Vietnamese citizens in their free time. All this enables them to achieve great successes in training and labor. In particular, (Vu Tkhi Loan) and Nguyen (Tkhi Nyung) have become production frontrunners at the Krasnodar cotton textiles combine, as has Nguyen (Tkhi Kim Ngok) at the Donetsk cotton textiles combine. In Astrakhan, spinner (Chan Tkhi Le Khang) is renowned as a labor frontrunner, as is welder (Kui) in Kemerovo.

At Soviet enterprises, (Tyu) stressed, Vietnamese citizens will acquire very rich experience from the Soviet working class, so that on their return to the motherland they will be able to make their contribution to building the material and technical base of socialism in the SRV. Vietnamese citizens working in the USSR, Nguyen (Shin Tyu) noted at the end of our talk, met with indignation the new onslaughts by bourgeois propaganda, which is trying to undermine our peoples' friendship and cooperation. You will not succeed, gentlemen, with your disinformation!

ROMANOV MEETS KAMPUCHEA'S HENG SAMRIN IN LAOS

PM061145 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 May 82 p 4

[TASS report: "Friendly Meeting"]

[Text] Following the conclusion of the Third Lao People's Revolutionary Party Congress the CPSU delegation headed by G.V. Romanov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Leningradskiy Obkom, had a meeting in Vientiane with the delegation of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea headed by Heng Samrin, general secretary of the party's Central Committee. Warm, friendly talks were held.

TIKHONOV GREETES WESTERN SAMOA'S WA'AI COLONE

LD051502 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT 5 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 5 May, TASS -- Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Nikolay Tikhonov has sent a message to the prime minister of the Western Samoa, Wa'ai Colone, conveying congratulations on the occasion of his election to the high post and sincere wishes of successes in his activities.

In his reply message the prime minister of Western Samoa expressed gratitude for the congratulations and kind wishes and on his part conveyed the best wishes to Nikolay Tikhonov, the government and the people of the Soviet Union.

The messages express the hope that Soviet-Western Samoa relations will be further favourably developed in the interests of the peoples of the two countries.

PRAVDA NOTES SEJM REMARKS ON NATIONAL ACCORD

PM061329 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 82 p 5

[Text] Warsaw, 4 May (TASS) -- The Polish Sejm session being held here has adopted a statement on the subject of national accord.

The Polish Sejm stated its desire to increase the strength of the state, to implement economic, social and political reforms and to create the conditions for the homeland's successful development. The Sejm reaffirmed its support for the patriotic movement for cooperation among all citizens in the cause of national rebirth.

Both creative ideas and views and actions introducing anarchy into social life and disorganizing the economy emerged in Poland in the turbulent years of 1980-1981, the statement says. The introduction of martial law created an obstacle to the destructive processes and regained for Poland trust within the framework of the alliance of socialist states. The necessary conditions have arisen to make possible a return to normal functioning of the state. On the basis of the experience of the post-August period, everything that was a manifestation of just desires on the part of the working people to jointly resolve their affairs must be preserved, and everything that may threaten the interests of the socialist state must be rejected.

We are faced with tremendous tasks. We must revive the motherland, ensuring the conditions to prevent further destructive crises and an organization of our affairs that accords with the principles of socialism as a system of social justice and at the same time ensures harmony between the interests of society and the interests of the individual, the development of the individual and everyone's respect. We must surmount the economic and social crisis and restore to Poland a fitting place in the modern world. The guarantee of Poland's security in Europe is the alliance and close cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The Sejm expresses the profound conviction that the Polish people are strong enough to emerge from the crisis, ensure the full utilization of production capacities and provide the people with appropriate living standards.

The last few months have been marked by hard work by the Military Council of National Salvation and the government, great work by the party and extensive activity by political parties and organizations.

The Sejm draws attention to the tremendous harm and impermissibility of any attempts to create chaos and to incite the people against the legitimate authorities.

The Sejm advocated the continued elaboration of a number of laws and in particular the resumption of work on the law on trade unions.

The need was noted to continue efforts to create and strengthen the basis of cooperation among all forces of the people: the PZPR and the allied parties, unions and organizations of secular Catholics, trade unions, youth and public organizations and creative associations. The Sejm made a positive assessment of the movement of Civil Committees of National Salvation and Rebirth.

The Sejm called on the various strata of the country's population to make efforts to overcome the crisis and to work vigorously for the future.

COMPARISON OF POLISH ARTICLE ON CIA ACTIVITY

Comparison reveals the TASS report on the CIA in Poland published on page F1 of the 6 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT is reproduced verbatim on page 5 of Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 6 May, 1982, under the headline "Exposure of CIA Agents," but without the concluding passage which starts in the next to last paragraph with "The intensification of activity..." and runs to the end of the TASS item.

PRAVDA DESCRIBES POLISH COOPERATION AT AES

PM060859 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 22 April publishes on page 4 a 1,500-word report from Khmel'nitskaya Oblast by special correspondent S. Baygarov under the heading "Pines Over the Roof," describing the construction of the Khmel'nitskaya AES and the reservoir and city to be created with it. The bulk of the report is devoted to an account of meetings with Polish workers who have come to take part in the construction of the AES under the intergovernment agreement on the station signed in March 1979 by the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia. The report notes at the construction site "close ties were established from the very first day between the two party organizations -- the CPSU and the PZPR. The Soviet Communists made considerable efforts to ensure that the Polish workers' technicians and engineers felt comfortable on Soviet soil, going on to describe various social and cultural events organized by the groups of Polish and Soviet workers. The report also notes that Polish specialists have become patrons of two kolkhozes in the region.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA VIEWS YUGOSLAV ARMY PARTY PARLEY

PM050929 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Apr 82 p 1

[Text] Belgrade, 27 Apr (TASS) -- A conference of the LCY organization in the Yugoslav People's Army has been held within the framework of preparation for the 12th LCY Congress. Its delegates summed up the results of the communist servicemen's work in the period under review and outlined tasks for the future.

The conference stressed the growing role of the army party organizations in improving units' and subunits' combat and political training standards and in the servicemen's patriotic education. The Yugoslav People's Army, born during the liberation struggle against the fascist invaders, the delegates pointed out, vigilantly stands guard over the working people's revolutionary gains and contributes to solving the SFRY's socio-economic development tasks. The consolidation of the armed forces accords with the historical interests of the country's working class and LCY policy.

Army General N. Ljubicic, member of the LCY Central Committee Presidium and federal secretary for national defense, who addressed the conference, stated that the communists must be in the front ranks of the struggle for progress. Without a stable economy and the rallying of the Yugoslav peoples around the LCY, he stressed, there can be no stable defense.

The document adopted at the conference stresses that the Yugoslav Armed Forces will continue to be the reliable bulwark of the working class and LCY in the struggle for consistent implementation of the revolutionary gains.

The Yugoslav People's Army LCY organization committee was elected. Col Gen Dane Cuic was reelected chairman of the committee.

KOSOVO PROVINCE LCY CONFERENCE REVIEWS PROBLEMS

PM061437 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Apr 82 p 4

[Text] Belgrade, 28 Apr (TASS) -- As TANJUG reports, a conference of the provincial League of Communists organization has been held in Pristina, administrative center of the autonomous province of Kosovo. The main topic was the internal political situation in the province.

It was noted at the conference that the situation in Kosovo has deteriorated recently as a result of nationalist actions as well as a number of economic problems.

It was reported that in some sectors -- especially coal mining, the power industry and nonferrous metallurgy -- the volume of production has fallen significantly. There is lagging in commissioning important projects, such as the second phase of a thermal power station near Pristina and the Ibar-Lepenac hydroelectric and irrigation system. In the opinion of the conference participants the economic difficulties are due to the low level of labor productivity and the failure to fully utilize production capacities because of the shortage of raw and other materials, which are mainly imported.

The delegates also noted the weakening of the leading role of the provincial party organization, the disruption of unity in its ranks and the communists' passivity. It was reported that many party organizations have failed to show vigilance in connection with the subversive activity of nationalist elements or a critical approach to the economic and social problems which have arisen.

The conference stressed that the normalization of the situation in Kosovo can only be achieved on the basis of intensified activity by the LCY and all socialist forces which accords with the interests of the working class and working people in the country.

PRAVDA REVIEWS SOVIET-FINNISH CONTACTS

PM060945 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 May 82 p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting at the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A meeting between delegations of the CPSU and Finland's Center Party [KP] was taken place at the CPSU Central Committee. Taking part in the meeting for the CPSU were: B.N. Ponomarev (head of delegation), candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V.A. Karlov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of the CPSU Central Committee Agriculture Department; V.I. Konotop, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Moskovskiy CPSU Obkom; A.F. Rummyantsev, member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission and chief editor of EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA; and V.S. Shaposhnikov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department. Taking part for Finland's KP were: P. Vayrynen (head of delegation), party chairman and member of Parliament; S. Kaariainen, KP general secretary; K.H. Eskelinen, member of the party board and member of Parliament; E. Uusitalo, member of Parliament; H. Linna, member of Parliament and chairman of a provincial organization; O. From and M. Lehtosaari, members of the party board and chairmen of provincial organizations; P. Vuola and I. Antonen, chairmen of provincial organizations, and also E. Tikka, chief of the KP apparatus' international department.

During the talk, which proceeded in a businesslike and friendly atmosphere, there was an exchange of opinions on topical problems in the current international situation, Soviet-Finnish relations and further contacts between the two parties.

The KP representatives reported on their party's foreign and domestic political activity. They noted that the KP has supported traditionally Finland's basic foreign policy course -- the "Paasikivi-Kekkonen line." This line, based on the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Aid between Finland and the USSR, guarantees the steady development of friendship and cooperation in relations with the Soviet Union and contains Finland's desire to implement a peace-loving neutral policy in the interests of international peace and security and of maintaining friendly relations with all countries. The KP representatives stated that their party would continue in the future to follow U. Kekkonen's line and strive to strengthen the preconditions for firm cooperation with the other progressive and democratic forces of Finland.

The CPSU side said that the Soviet Union values highly the tremendous work of President U. Kekkonen in developing good-neighborliness, friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Finland.

The CPSU representatives reported on the progress in fulfilling the 26th CPSU Congress decisions, on the Soviet people's achievements in the economic, social and cultural spheres and on the party's foreign policy activity.

In discussing international problems the representatives of both parties expressed profound concern at the buildup of tension in the world, and primarily at the arms race which is increasing the threat of war. The great importance of vigorous activity on the part of political parties, the general public and all peace-loving forces to avert nuclear catastrophe was stressed.

In this connection the joint opinion was expressed on the need to promote the achievement of agreement on limiting nuclear arms in Europe and on the soonest resumption of talks on limiting strategic arms on the basis of observance of the principle of equality and identical security, and on the need for a Soviet-American summit meeting.

The sides were unanimous that the interests of detente would be met by the consistent continuation of the process begun by the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and they believe that the holding of a conference on confidence-building measures, security and disarmament in Europe is a primary task.

Emphasis was placed on the importance of preserving and strengthening peace and stability in northern Europe and in the Baltic region also and, in this connection, on the importance of the constant topicality of Finland's efforts on the issue of creating a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe and consolidating security in this region. The KP noted the constructive nature of the proposals advanced by L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, concerning ways of putting this idea into practice.

Representatives of both parties expressed satisfaction at the successful development of Soviet-Finnish relations. It was noted that the Soviet Union values highly the prominent role which the KP has played and continues to play in this matter. Both sides declared their desire to do everything to preserve, guard and further develop the trust and friendship which has taken shape between the peoples of Finland and the Soviet Union. They declared their full support for the clauses contained in the Soviet-Finnish joint announcement published in connection with the working visit to the USSR by Finnish President Koivisto.

Both delegations specially stressed the importance of the further development of trade and economic cooperation between the USSR and Finland. The KP representatives noted the great stabilizing significance of this cooperation for Finland's economic development and for employment in the country.

They expressed satisfaction at the contacts which exist between the CPSU and the KP and stressed their readiness to develop these contacts in the future.

The KP delegation visited areas of Moskovskaya Oblast, where they familiarized themselves with the work of agricultural enterprises and the living conditions of rural workers.

FRENCH POLITICAL COMMENTATOR VISITS KAZAKH SSR

GF300831 Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 28 Apr 82

[Text] Famous French publisher and political commentator of L'HUMANITE (Henry Alex) visited the Kazakh SSR for a few days. During his stay in the Kazakh SSR, the guest from France called on the Kazakh State Committee for Publishing and visited the Kazakh Academy of Sciences history and archaeology departments, the [word indistinct] institute of law and other scientific establishments.

On his current visit to Kazakh SSR, (Henry Alex) said he would be writing a book on the Kazakh SSR's great achievements in developing its economy, science and culture. He added: In my book, I shall be giving particular emphasis to the resolution of national matters in the Central Asian republics and the Kazakh SSR within the Soviet Union.

PRAVDA NOTES TURKEY UNWILLING TO AID RDF

PM051321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 May 82 p 5

[Correspondent A. Filippov dispatch: "Turkey's Position"]

[Text] Ankara, 2 May -- A session of the U.S.-Turkish "joint defense group" created during the U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger's visit to Ankara last December has been held here.

The communique, abounding in phrases concerning the need to develop military cooperation between the two countries and to consolidate the NATO bloc, notes that the talks focused on questions of modernizing the Turkish Armed Forces with U.S. aid.

Well-informed observers point out that it was not only these questions which were discussed. The U.S. military delegation, Western news agency reports said, come to Ankara to try to persuade their "hosts" of the need to assume additional commitments to implement U.S. plans in the Near and Middle East region.

However, on the eve of the talks, through National Defense Minister H. Bayulken, in an interview with Western reporters who had come to cover the Ankara meeting, Turkey directly stated that in no circumstances would it take part in U.S. plans to use Rapid Deployment Forces in that part of the world.

The minister also noted Turkey's desire to see Europe free of nuclear weapons, mentioning that there are no nuclear missile weapons deployed in Turkish territory.

IZVESTIYA ON PLANS FOR NATO FORCES IN DENMARK

LD301758 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 3 May 82

["How To Please Washington" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 3 May, TASS -- "The plans to establish in Denmark's territory NATO's reinforcement forces amount to an about-face in the defence policy of that country, which used to rely on a commitment not to deploy in its territory foreign troops and nuclear weapons in peace time", writes IZVESTIYA today. The newspaper says that in this particular case what is at issue is that the Danish Government, yielding to pressure from outside, has agreed to the deployment in the territory of Denmark of allied reinforcements in so-called "crisis situations".

Word has leaked to the press, the newspaper says, that NATO plans include stationing in Danish territory thirteen thousand British Marines, a major part of the forty thousand contingent of U.S. Marines intended for waging hostilities in NATO's northern flank, as well as 120 American fighters and two squadrons of the British "Jaguar" fighters. What is also planned is a corresponding expansion of military storage facilities and air fields of NATO in Danish territory, whose construction will require no less than 750 million Danish kroner.

"The Danish people are above all concerned that the presence of allied reinforcements increases the dangerous prospect for the country to be drawn into a nuclear catastrophe," IZVESTIYA says. "The fact is that the 'reinforcements' will be placed under the NATO command and equipped with arms ordinary for them, probably also including nuclear weapons." The newspaper says that Denmark is being assigned the role of a staging area from which the ground and airborne allied reinforcements will be able to be rapidly moved to a proposed theatre of military operations, for instance to the north of Norway.

"NATO command's plans also include using in the territory of Denmark and Norway not only defensive but also offensive weapons," the article says. "That is why NATO's dangerous plans to draw Denmark and Norway into its nuclear preparations are a matter of legitimate concern to the peoples of all the Nordic countries. That is why the movement to make the north of Europe into a zone free from nuclear weapons is gathering momentum every day."

'ARAFAT INTERVIEWED IN BEIRUT BY MOSCOW TV

LD061954 Moscow TASS in English 1935 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 6 May, TASS -- "The bandit Isareli air raid on the neighbourhood of Beirut and Saida by newest U.S. F-15 and F-16 planes indicates that Zionists are going to carry on with their aggression", said Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Executive Committee, in an interview with a Soviet television correspondent in Beirut, broadcast today.

"Israeli military divisions are aiming at the south of Lebanon," he continued. "Begin's recent statement shows that Israel will continue military activities against the Lebanese and Palestinian people".

"It must be noted", 'Arafat went on to say, "that Tel Aviv pursues its policy with the full support of the United States. It is an attempt to impose on the Palestinian people what is notoriously known as civil administration and then scanty autonomy".

"Meanwhile the Zionists are vigorously colonising occupied lands. I would like to stress", Yasir 'Arafat said, "that despite the unlimited aid which the Israeli military gets from the United States, the Palestinian people is confident of the ultimate victory of its just cause. For we are not alone in our struggle. The Palestinian people has on its side his true friends -- the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

"Leonid Brezhnev stressed many times that the Palestinian people has the right to return to the motherland, the right to self-determination and to the creation of its own independent state", Yasir 'Arafat said in conclusion.

BRUTENTS CONTINUES COMMENTARY ON MIDEAST ISSUES

PM061541 Kuwait AL-WATAN in Arabic 25 Apr 82 p 10

[Part Two of three-part AL-WATAN correspondent's interview with Karen Brutents, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, in Moscow: "Brezhnev's Settlement Initiative Is Positive Alternative to Camp David"; date not specified]

[Text] Question: At the 26th CPSU Congress Leonid Brezhnev discussed the Middle East question. He proposed a return to the collective search for a Middle East settlement through an international conference to be held for this purpose. On the same occasion, the Soviet Union reaffirmed its willingness to cooperate in this respect with the parties concerned, meaning the Arabs, including the PLO, Israel, the United States and Europe. Middle East developments indicate that both Israel and the United States openly refuse to cooperate with any side in promoting a just and acceptable settlement in the Middle East. In your opinion, is the Soviet initiative on the Middle East still as important as ever, bearing in mind the position of the United States and Israel, which are using every means to revive the Camp David accords for which the principles of the 1 October 1977 U.S.-Soviet declaration on the Middle East and the idea of a Geneva peace conference have been sacrificed? In your opinion, what practical steps should be taken to manifest the initiatives presented during the 26th congress and, generally speaking, how do you assess West Europe's role in the search for a settlement in the Middle East?

Answer: We believe that the Soviet initiative on the Middle East presented to the 26th CPSU Congress is still fully as important as ever. We say that when the initiative was made nobody thought that the United States and Israel would quickly come forward to join it. It is known, as you have said yourself, that neither Israel nor the United States has shown any interest in the search for a just and lasting solution to the Middle East conflict. They uphold the Camp David deal, which imposes unfair conditions on the Arabs. In practical terms it imposes capitulation on the Arabs.

The Soviet proposals, however, seek a real settlement in the Middle East taking into consideration the legitimate rights of all parties concerned. They spell out the necessary prerequisites for such a settlement -- namely, Israeli withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied in 1967 and the Palestinian Arab people's exercise of the right to self-determination and an independent state.

Does this mean that the U.S. and Israeli attitudes can prevent the struggle to bring about the international conference in question? Certainly not. Our proposals, as the positive and realistic alternative to Camp David, not only strengthen the struggle against the attempts to preserve or revive the separate deals policy but also provide the ground for joint efforts by all the parties interested in a real settlement in the Middle East, whether in the Arab homeland -- which of course is the side directly concerned -- or in the socialist states and other peace-loving states, in addition to the various democratic and progressive social forces. It is known that our proposals have been widely and solidly supported at the international level. I can say that whether realistic prospects for holding the conference are short-term or long-term would depend on the practical efforts made and on the pressure that such efforts brought to bear on those who are at present blocking the road to a real settlement. In this respect, I wish to mention in particular the role of the Arab states, the tremendous advantages of Arab solidarity based on opposition to imperialism and struggle for a Middle East settlement, and the use of Arab resources against the Israeli aggressors and their imperialist masters. Imperialism and Israel are largely exploiting Arab contradictions and disputes to serve their interests and prevent the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

As far as the West European states are concerned, their role would depend on the position they can take. Comrade Brezhnev's initiative calls for the participation of West European states in the conference we are talking about. We have no doubt that if the West European states take a constructive and independent stand, or at least a nonaligned stand taking into consideration the interests of all the parties to the Middle East conflict, they would be able to positively and effectively influence the course of events related to this issue. We believe, however, that the states of Western Europe to date have not exploited this potential, primarily because they have not rejected the Camp David policy, and the latest proof of this is the fact that a number of West European states have contributed to the so-called multinational force in Sinai. This of course means support and backing for the Camp David process, whatever the justifications offered by the West European politicians.

Question: Israel's declared annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights is in actual fact tantamount to a declaration of war on Syria and the Arab states and is a blatant violation of all the UN resolutions and statements. The impression one gets is that events are indeed leading up to a war between the two countries, because Israel is concentrating troops in the Golan Heights area. It is known that there is a friendship treaty between Syria and the Soviet Union. Syrian officials have, frequently and on various occasions, given the impression that, after the signing of the treaty, the Soviet Union will not allow the destruction of Syria. What, in your view, are the possibilities of a new war in the Middle East, and is there any willingness on the part of the Soviet Union to dispatch its forces, should Syria make such a request, as a military backup to the Syrian military forces?

Answer: As long as the threat of an explosion exists in the Middle East, as Soviet leaders have stressed more than once in their statements, there will always be a danger of a new war. The Soviet Union firmly advocates the promotion of a real settlement in the Middle East because it supports the legitimate rights and interests of the Arab people and because it seeks peace and security for all nations. The Middle East and the Middle East conflict are a source of tension which is a threat to world peace. As for the recent events in the Middle East, particularly Israel's arrogant and insolent moves such as the annexation of the Golan Heights, they are further evidence of Israel's growing aggressiveness, reflecting the growing U.S. aggressiveness the U.S. policy of creating world tension and trouble.

Furthermore, Israel's growing aggressiveness feeds on increasing and open U.S. protection and on the further strengthening of U.S.-Israeli military ties, clearly manifested in the U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation agreement. Therefore Israeli adventures, which were never ruled out in the past, should not be ruled out now.

As for the various attitudes that might emerge if Israel took a new aggressive step, it is difficult to assess them fully and there is no need to discuss them in advance. At any rate, all the forces with any degree of influence on the Middle East situation will, it seems, have to take into consideration the Soviet-Syrian friendship treaty, which denotes the high level of cooperation between our two countries, as well as Syria's role in confronting imperialist designs in the Middle East. I will just say that, as always, the Soviet Union will be true to the letter and spirit of that treaty.

[Question] The U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation agreement is further evidence of the existence of a bilateral aggressive alliance against the Arab nation and, above all, against the Palestinian resistance movement, the Steadfastness Front states and the Soviet Union. To what extent is the Soviet Union willing to provide support for the Palestinian resistance movement and the Steadfastness Front states? Do you believe that the friendship treaties concluded between the Soviet Union and Syria and South Yemen constitute an effective way to counter this U.S.-Israeli alliance? What, in your opinion, is the right way to react to this step on the Arab and international levels?

Answer: The U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation agreement has exposed what the United States has been trying in every way to conceal from world public opinion in general and the Arab public opinion in particular. I mean by that the close coordination between U.S. and Israeli policies on the principles of political and military strategy. The U.S.-Israeli agreement is at the same time a new move to further strengthen this coordination, and it means that Israel is directly involved in the U.S. strategic military plans reflecting the Pentagon's intentions, which are currently materializing in the world under circumstances of increasing U.S. aggressiveness in the international arena. The U.S. aim is known to be the destruction of detente, sharp escalation of the arms race and suppression of national liberation movements. This is why U.S. policy is becoming increasingly militarist.

Furthermore, this agreement encourages Israel to embark on more aggressive moves, and it is a motivation for the Israeli rulers to pursue their hazardous policy of occupation, as indicated by the recent Israeli annexation of the Golan Heights.

The Soviet Union has strongly condemned the U.S.-Israeli strategic cooperation agreement because it is directed against the interests of the Arab people and world peace and security, including the security of the Soviet Union. The Soviet assessment of this agreement was presented in the Soviet official documents during the contacts with the states concerned. Obviously, the Soviet Union cannot remain idle in relation to the aspects of this agreement about which I have already spoken. We are capable of adequately protecting our interests and security and of meeting the challenge posed by this agreement. We will undoubtedly continue with our policy of support for the Arab states in their confrontation of U.S.-encouraged Israeli aggression. This applies to the Steadfastness and Confrontation Front states and the Palestinian resistance movement, with which we have strong and friendly relations and profound cooperation. We believe that these friendly relations will develop and grow further in the future.

As for the two friendship treaties concluded between the Soviet Union and the PDRY, they constitute an important and special link in this cooperation, and they naturally play a major part in the confrontation of U.S. and Israel aggressive designs in the region and in further enhancing Arab-Soviet relations. We also believe that the natural answer to the growing U.S. and Israeli aggressiveness in the Middle East lies in the general activation of efforts to expose U.S. and Israeli designs, the expansion of support for the just Arab cause, and further international isolation of the U.S. and Israeli "hawks."

I have already said and I repeat here that the solidarity of the Arab countries and the nationalist forces in the Arab world is of major importance, on the basis of struggle against these aggressive designs and for a just settlement in the Middle East.

Question: When Israel announced its decision to annex the Golan Heights, the United States quickly condemned this step. On the basis of your analysis of U.S.-Israeli relations, how serious are such statements? Do you believe that Israel has really broken its recent strategic alliance with the United States, as claimed by Menahem Begin, on the grounds of so-called U.S.-Israeli differences over the Golan Heights issue? Now, in your view, will such Israeli attitudes affect the future of U.S.-Israeli strategic alliance?

Answer: The facts provide the answer to this question. As you know, the United States did not support the UN Security Council resolution condemning Israel. U.S. diplomacy also used the arm-twisting and pressure approach to prevent the condemnation of Israel by the UN General Assembly. This unequivocally demonstrated to everyone who had any doubt that the U.S. denunciation of the Golan Heights annexation was an act of hypocrisy aimed at misleading world opinion and, above all, Arab opinion. This "denunciation" was only a maneuver to conceal the U.S. plan to penetrate the Middle East, maintain the "Camp David process," and exploit the Arab states with close U.S. links to serve these objectives. The line pursued by U.S. diplomacy during the UN debate on the Israeli occupation moves exposed yet again and most clearly the protection that inspires the Israeli rulers to carry out their aggressive policies, and exposed those whose support and backing make the implementation of these policies possible.

As for the so-called breakdown of U.S.-Israeli cooperation, events have indeed shown that it was a "family quarrel" meant to a large extent to play on the feelings of the people. All this is now in the past, and the United States and Israel are cooperating smoothly and coordinating their policies within the context of the strategic alliance agreement.

Question: Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter said when he was president that the United States has vital interests in the Gulf region. President Brezhnev declared his now-known principles for ensuring the neutrality of the Gulf region. Since then the United States has taken practical steps such as encircling the region with naval fleets and setting up the Rapid Deployment Force. These steps have aroused anxiety and anticipation in several Gulf countries. This anxiety increased after the U.S. military exercises in the region. What is the Soviet position on the U.S. activities in the Gulf region? Are there any Soviet plans to set up similar forces to ward off the threat of U.S. intervention in certain areas, particularly areas which have friendly relations with the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union?

Answer: Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter did indeed say that the Gulf region -- which is thousands of miles away from the United States -- was within the sphere of U.S. vital interests, as if this region belonged to no one or as if it did not belong to its own people, particularly the Arab people. The present U.S. administration has maintained and intensified this expansionist line. Within the framework of an increasingly militant foreign policy, it has been making concerted efforts to set up the so-called Rapid Deployment Force, expand U.S. military and naval presence in the region, and set up a complete network of military bases there to act as U.S. staging posts, threaten the peoples of the region, combat the national liberation movement there and also carry out its general strategic military designs against the Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist countries. Obviously, this kind of U.S. imperialist activity is bound to arouse the anxiety of all peace-loving nations, and especially the countries in the region. It also naturally makes the Soviet Union more cautious, whether in relation to our interest in consolidating world peace and preserving detente or in relation to matters affecting the security of our country.

As you may recall, the Soviet Union, through Soviet state and Communist Party head Comrade Brezhnev, made certain proposals aimed at ensuring normal conditions -- that is, peace and security in the Gulf region. The Soviet Union proposed to all parties concerned that agreement be reached on the following mutual commitments:

1. Refraining from setting up foreign military bases in the Gulf region and adjacent islands and from stockpiling nuclear arms or any other type of mass destruction arms there.
2. Refraining from using or threatening to use force against Gulf countries, and non-interference in their domestic affairs.
3. Respect for the nonalignment line chosen by the Gulf states, and refraining from dragging them into military blocs which include nuclear powers.
4. Respect for the right of the states in the region to sovereignty over their natural resources.
5. Refraining from placing any obstacles or making any threats which might prejudice the normal trade exchanges and disturb the use of sea routes between the states in the region and the rest of the world.

These are very balanced proposals. They above all taken into consideration the interests of the states in the region and all other states concerned. If accepted, these proposals could easily ensure security in the region and help consolidate the independence of the Gulf states. The aggressive U.S. policy in that part of the world, made more evident and more dangerous by its abounding military spirit, has been strongly condemned by the Soviet Union. In view of the international weight and influence of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist bloc, this condemnation is significant and cannot be ignored by those who are bent on turning the Gulf region into a hotbed of tension.

Our country obviously does not stop at mere condemnation, however strong. We are always calling for maximum reduction of Soviet and American military activity in the Gulf and Indian Ocean area, and for collective efforts to implement measures to guarantee peace, confidence and security in the said area. It is clear that we cannot fail to draw certain conclusions and examples from the aggressive U.S. military preparations and take the necessary steps dictated by our national interests. It is equally clear that the Soviet Union deplores the idea of setting up forces like the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force.

In answer to your question, I would like to mention the considerable Soviet aid provided to strengthen the defense capabilities of the Arab states in various parts of the Arab world. This assistance, as you know, has frequently earned the highest appreciation of political leaders and prominent figures in the Arab countries. There is no doubt that the military capability resulting from this assistance seriously strengthens the Arab position to a major extent and is a real deterrent against the Israeli aggressive circles indirectly supported by the United States.

LEADERS CONFER WITH VISITING IRAQI OFFICIALS

Patolichev, 'Awdah

PM061407 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Apr 82 p 4

[Text] TASS -- On 27 April, Foreign Trade Minister N. S. Patolichev received M.M. 'Awdah, Iraqi deputy trade minister, who is visiting Moscow in connection with talks on the signing of a trade protocol between the USSR and Iraq for 1982. Questions of Soviet-Iraqi trade relations were discussed during the friendly talk.

Arkipov, At-Tawfiq

PM061107 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 May 82 p 4

[Text] TASS -- On 30 April I.V. Arkipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received in the Kremlin and had a talk with Tahir at-Tawfiq, Iraqi minister of industry and minerals who is in Moscow in connection with the 12th session of the permanent Soviet-Iraqi Commission for Economic and Technical Cooperation.

PRAVDA PUBLISHES ORTEGA SPEECH AT KREMLIN DINNER

PM061341 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 82 p 2

[TASS report under the general heading "In A Friendly Atmosphere" -- speech delivered by D. Ortega Saavedra, member of the National Leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front and coordinator of the Guiding Council of the Government of National Reconstruction, at a dinner held in honor of visiting Nicaraguan state delegation in the Kremlin on 4 May]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Brezhnev!

Soviet comrades!

Nicaraguan comrades!

Some 25 years ago at the 6th World Festival of Youth and Students, Carlos Fonseca, leader of the Nicaraguan revolution and founder of the Sandinist National Liberation Front [FSLN], planted a tree in Moscow park as a token of the fraternal friendship between Sandino's people and Lenin's people. We can now say that that tree has grown into a sturdy and indestructible symbol of the relations between our peoples, governments and parties.

We regard as a great honor for us the invitation received from the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Soviet Government -- the true expressers of the vivid history of the Soviet people, who despite aggression, hunger and privation stood firm and routed imperialist and fascist invaders.

We hold in reverence the memory of the 20 million Soviet people who fell in the Great Patriotic War for the liberation of all mankind from the fascist yoke and do so with the same feeling of deepest respect in which we hold the thousands of our heroes who gave their lives for the Nicaraguan revolution.

We know how, despite aggression and adversity, in a short span of history, the Soviet working people have achieved impressive successes in developing their country. The cornerstone of that development is the principles on which the potential which guarantees the unprecedented stability of the socioeconomic system in the interests of the working people's well-being is being built. We know what successes were achieved in solving the main tasks of the 11th 5-Year Plan and are confident that the strong hands of the millions of people united in Soviet trade unions will ensure the fulfillment of the tasks which they have been set.

The new peace initiatives advanced in the report delivered by Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to the 26th CPSU Congress must be given the support of all the world's progressive and democratic forces.

Nicaragua supports the proposition in the 26th CPSU Congress report that on an international level there is no more important task facing the party, the Soviet people and all the peoples of our planet than that of upholding peace. We welcome the concrete and important step in this direction announced by Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev regarding the unilateral establishment of a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the USSR.

The spirit of fraternal mutual understanding in which the talks have been held, the Soviet leaders' unpretentiousness and sincerity, and the resolute solidarity which they have once again shown with Nicaragua guarantee the development of cooperative relations between our countries. We know that our talks and the agreements reached on cooperation are regarded with suspicion by those egoistically inclined circles which are unable to understand the desire of working people for solidarity in their struggle to defend their freedom and to achieve progress and happiness.

Dear Comrade Brezhnev, on 19 July 1979 the fetters of imperialist oppression and exploitation were shattered. Starting on that day, revolutionary power born in the midst of workers and peasants and in the struggle of the oppressed and exploited was established in Nicaragua.

Despite the hardships and privations and the military, political and economic aggression, the power won that day put down deep roots in the people's hearts. Its economic and administrative base is growing stronger by the day. The strength of the power which has been won lies in the increasing effectiveness of the instruments created by the revolution for its own defense, in the working people's increasing participation in the solution of the tasks set by the revolution, in mass organizations' increasing role, in the Sandinist revolution's high international prestige, and in the strengthening of relations with friends who are helping us overcome difficulties and lay the foundation of a new society.

We have ushered in an era of profound transformations in the economic sphere, as a result of which the remnants of dependence are being gradually liquidated and our people will have an opportunity to steadily improve their well-being. The process of reviving and developing our national culture -- a heritage now shared by the broad masses -- is undeniably underway in the new Nicaragua. The campaign to eradicate illiteracy was just the beginning of this.

We have achieved genuine democracy and genuine freedom for the people. All this happened thanks to the revolutionary experience of mankind, which is increasingly freeing itself of exploitation and oppression and raising the banner of justice, social progress and peace. The peoples of the world are now fighting for these aims with greater resolution than ever before.

Our foreign policy, which is conducted within the framework of nonalignment, consistently accords with the interests of the peoples demanding that a new international economic order be established. We have always condemned and continue to condemn colonialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism, racism, Zionism, apartheid and man's domination and exploitation of man in any form.

We are building a future inspired by a revolutionary people who are solving historic tasks under the guidance of the FSLN. The tasks facing us in the struggle were summed up thus by Carlos Fonseca, the FSLN's founder and leader: "It is a question not simply of changing the people in authority, but of changing the system itself, of ousting the exploiter classes and achieving victory for the exploited classes." Now that we hold power we can affirm that that the FSLN, which is the Nicaraguan people's undisputed vanguard, is leading our revolution and the building of a new society.

The imperialists may continue to encourage acts of aggression and to assail us with threats, and may even try to destroy Nicaragua and reduce our land to ashes, but they should know that we will never be subjugated because the power of workers and peasants, people's power, is invincible.

This conviction was voiced by Sandino 55 years ago on 4 May 1927 -- national dignity day -- when he refused to lay down his arms in the face of armed U.S. intervention.

I propose a toast: to the health of that unflagging champion of the working people's cause, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev; to everlasting friendship between the peoples of Nicaragua and the Soviet Union; to the radiant memory of the heroes who gave their lives for Soviet power and the heroes slain while defending mankind from fascism; to the cause of peace and peaceful cooperation among peoples; to the triumph of the oppressed throughout the world; to Lenin and to Sandino; to the CPSU; to the FSLN! A free motherland or Death!

ROMANOV RECEIVES NICARAGUAN DELEGATION 6 MAY

LD061716 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Comrade Romanov, Politburo member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Leningrad Obkom, today in the Smolnyy received the state delegation from the Republic of Nicaragua led by Ortega Saavedra, member of the National Leadership of the Sandinista National Liberation Front, coordinator of the Guiding Council of the Government of National Reconstruction and commandante of the revolution. In the course of the conversation, Comrade Romanov stressed that the people of Leningrad, as all Soviet people, welcome the delegation's official friendly visit to the Soviet Union and the meetings and talks that have been held in Moscow. Daniel Ortega talked of the development of the revolutionary process in Nicaragua and the social transformations taking place in the country. He noted that his country supports the Soviet Union's efforts to curb the arms race and strengthen universal peace and security.

USSR TO HELP CUBA BUILD ATOMIC POWER STATION

LD061546 Moscow TASS in English 1514 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Leningrad, 6 May, TASS -- A project of an atomic electric power station for Cuba has been drawn up by Leningrad specialists. The total capacity of its two generating sets will be 880 megawatts.

The station will be constructed with Soviet assistance which is envisaged by the inter-governmental agreement on economic and scientific-technical cooperation, which was signed on April 17 last year. Cuba, member of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, will also be assisted by other socialist countries, members of the organization.

A number of changes linked with natural-climatic conditions of Cuba were introduced into the standard-station project which was used in building similar structures in the USSR, other European CMEA member-countries and in Finland, a TASS correspondent has been told by chief engineer of the project group Vadim Sobolyev. The radiation-protection system will make the station fully safe for the environment even in an earthquake of up to 8 points on the Richter scale. New anti-corrosion coatings and materials will be used with due account for tropical climate.

The Soviet Union is one of the main exporters of atomic energy generating equipment in the international market, recalled Vadim Sobolyev. Atomic electric power stations, built with Soviet technical assistance, are successfully functioning in the GDR and Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Finland. A number of stations are under construction in the GDR, Czechoslovakia, other countries of the socialist community. The total capacity of atomic energy-generating sets, built abroad with Soviet assistance, have already reached more than 5 million kilowatts.

The first atomic electric power station was built in the USSR in 1954. (It was also the world's first.) Atomic electric power stations are now functioning in the whole territory of the country -- from Armenia's mountains in the south to areas beyond the polar circle.

The experience of exploitation of such stations, which was accumulated in the USSR, proved their economic expediency, the chief engineer said. The prime cost of electric energy, generated by an atomic electric power station, is below that generated by the traditional method. Atomic electric power stations do not require oxygen. Their influence upon the environment is considerably less than that of thermal power stations which release into the atmosphere sulphur dioxide and ash. Besides, an atomic electric power station helps save hundreds of thousands of tons of oil and coal.

REPORT ON CHILEAN SOCIALIST PARTY DOCUMENT

PY060927 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2000 GMT 5 May 82

[Commentary by Hernan del Canto, member of the Chilean Socialist Party leadership]

[Text] Dear friends and listeners:

The country's current political problems were discussed at length at a recent national plenary meeting of the Chilean Socialist Party [PS] held in a strictly underground environment in the country. Similarly, leading international issues which undoubtedly today have a heavy impact on Chilean reality were also discussed.

Today, however, we want to specifically discuss one of the main conclusions of the PS plenary meeting which referred to our own struggle only a few days after celebrating a landmark event for both the international and Chilean labor movement -- 1 May, a day of struggle and unity, a day of memories and hopes in a more promising future for the workers and the people.

In a document approved at the plenum and referring to the country's domestic situation, the Chileans socialists state that the remedies applied by the Pinochet regime following recommendations of the "Chicago boys" have caused a crisis. The PS document adds: The socioeconomic crisis we are experiencing are confirming in practice what we had already predicted in theory: The model based on domination by financial capital could not possibly solve our basic problems [words indistinct].

What happens then, the PS states, is that the model supported and promoted by the armed forces has been questioned in practice -- in other words, the model which appeared as a creation of the dictatorship and which was used to justify repression, the trampling of freedom, misery, and so on, has demonstrably failed. The PS believes that as a result of this reality it is reasonable to expect that dissensions which have surfaced within the regime will widen, and adds that the signs of a new determination are perceived in the movement of the masses. Although slowly, the masses are moving from passive dissatisfaction to protesting and mobilizing against the dictatorship as was demonstrated the day before yesterday in the 1 May celebrations commemorated in several parts of our country.

Speaking about the permanent factors that characterized the situation, the PS states that in the first place the nature of the regime has not changed. It continues to be a criminal dictatorship which is in no position and which is unable to offer or to tolerate concessions aimed at promoting a political opening -- that is, the ouster of the dictatorship continues to be the essential mission lying ahead of the popular forces during this period.

Secondly, the PS adds, there is the situation of the bloc of opposition forces. They have not yet been able to overcome [words indistinct] last year at a time when the dictatorship seemed to be strong and solid. Just as this appearance is now beginning to fade away, the popular forces are becoming increasingly active and combative.

The PS document also states that the Christian Democratic Party has fallen into a position of immobility. At this juncture the loss of its traditional leader has furthered its uncertainties and hesitations. In our opinion, the PS states, the struggle against the dictatorship requires the participation of this force, whom we call upon to overcome its reluctance and to decidedly adopt a position of struggle.

In relation to the left, the PS states that the leftist sectors have also demonstrated that they are in a state of confusion and lack faith. But above all, they were most heavily affected by the emergence among them of [word indistinct] position. Therefore, the PS national plenum vigorously calls upon all leftist sectors to abandon defensive positions. We urge them to take every form of action required by the struggle in order to take advantage of the favorable conditions which are taking place. We reiterate, the PS says, our conviction that without a united left behind a socialist-oriented democratic proposal, the other opposition forces, due to their own nature, will not be able to lead the struggle against the dictatorship.

The PS views the proposal for unifying union sectors as undoubtedly positive and notes that the party should make every effort to contribute to promoting the unity of the union movement since the PS is most interested in strengthening the combative capability of the working class and of the working masses in general. The prospect of unifying the union movement within a combative national democratic platform is in no way negative, but can be instrumental in creating and developing a classical type union movement.

The document says that the regime is prepared to view the difficulties as temporary circumstances and adjustments. The PS adds: We should destroy that plan and act together so that this adjustment may become a major loophole in the government's system of domination. At this juncture we should avail ourselves of every form of struggle always keeping in mind the struggle of the masses. The PS adds: We support a bloc of popular democratic forces and broad antidictatorial agreements.

The document concludes by stating: The masses are awakening but it is primarily up to our boldness, decision to fight, intelligence and courage to get things done. The people and the working class now need leadership. It is our essential mission as a revolutionary force to provide them with this leadership.

CPSU LEADERS ATTEND PRAVDA ANNIVERSARY MEETING

LD052314 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 May 82

[Excerpt] A ceremonial meeting devoted to Press Day and the 70th anniversary of PRAVDA was held today in the Hall of Columns at the Soviet of the Union in Moscow. In the presidium were Comrade Ponomarev, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrades Zamyatin and Tyazhelnikov, heads of department at the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Shalaye, chairman of the AUCCTU; and Comrade Pastukhov, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee.

Yakut Days of Culture

LD052316 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 May 82

[Summary] The Days of Yakut ASSR Literature and Art opened in Moscow today. They are being held in honor of the anniversary of the formation of the Yakut ASSR and its voluntary entry into the Russian state. Present at the ceremonial opening were Comrades Demichev, Solomentsev, Kapitonov and leaders of party and Soviet organizations of the Yakut ASSR.

PRAVDA EDITORIAL HAILS MAY DAY FESTIVAL

PM061517 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Apr 82 p 1

[Editorial: "Red Banners Over the World"]

[Text] Soviet people are triumphantly and joyfully greeting the day of working people's international solidarity in the struggle against imperialism and for peace, democracy and socialism. Our brothers in socialist community countries and working people of the whole world will mark May Day with demonstrations and rallies. The red calico of banners, placards and slogans, a sea of people on city and settlement streets -- such is the colorful complexion of the proletarian holiday. Throughout the world, the communists' combat slogan is heard: "Proletariats of All Lands, Unite!"

The Soviet people are approaching May Day in an atmosphere of great political and labor enthusiasm. Inspired by the 26th CPSU Congress' historic decisions, millions of working people are persistently struggling for the successful fulfillment of the 11th 5-Year Plan targets and the further increase in their socialist motherland's economic and defense might. Our people unanimously approve and support the party's Leninist domestic and foreign policy and the tireless and fruitful activity of its Central Committee and Central Committee Politburo headed by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev.

The peoples of the socialist countries march in single formation with the Soviet Union. Marxism-Leninism -- the eternally living revolutionary international doctrine and the working people's powerful ideological weapon in the struggle against imperialism and for the victory of socialism and communism -- is the compass for the builders of a new society. The world socialist system -- the decisive force of the anti-imperialist struggle and the main bulwark of peace, democracy and social progress -- is steadily developing and strengthening.

Our party and state, guided by the great Lenin's behests and the peace program for the eighties adopted by the 26th CPSU Congress, are consistently continuing their peace-loving course. It is geared toward reducing the danger of military confrontation, preserving and consolidating peace and further developing cooperation among all states on the basis of the strict respect of each one's independence, rights and interests, and on the basis of noninterference in internal affairs and of joint efforts toward strengthening universal security and mutual trust. This policy is approved and supported by other fraternal parties and countries of the socialist community and all peace-loving forces.

Recently the international situation has worsened sharply and has begun to inspire justified alarm over the fate of peace, Washington's militarists, supported by some European NATO partners, are leading matters toward cranking up the arms race and disrupting normal ties among states.

"...We are firmly convinced that such a course cannot gain the people's support and has no future," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev has remarked. The CPSU Central Committee's May Day combat slogan -- to decisively rebuff the aggressive intrigues of imperialism, militarism and revanchism, to curb the arms race, to deepen detente and eliminate the threat of war -- is finding understanding and a broad response among the peoples of all countries.

Our people are confident that a new world war can be averted. This requires the vigorous actions of all peace-loving forces and all governments, political parties and politicians who value the peoples' future, the future of mankind. The CPSU Central Committee addresses an appeal to peace champions to increase their efforts in the sacred struggle for the greatest right -- the right to life -- and to resolutely advocate the banning of nuclear, neutron and chemical weapons. "No" to nuclear war! Peace for the world!

The problem of nuclear arms reduction in Europe merits special attention nowadays. The implementation of the U.S. plans to deploy about 600 Pershing-II and cruise missiles on the continent would be fraught with serious consequences for peace in Europe and would increase the danger of a nuclear holocaust. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union's new peace initiatives and the USSR's readiness, recently confirmed at the top level, for constructive dialogue with the United States open the way to achieving a rational understanding in the interests of peace and security in Europe and throughout the world. A broad response is being generated among the peoples of the European countries by our party's appeal: Resolutely oppose the deployment of new American nuclear missile weapons in West Europe. Peace, security and cooperation for Europe!

The role of the international working class and its combat vanguard -- the communist and workers' parties -- is increasing still further under conditions of the further worsening of the general crisis of capitalism and the tremendous scale of the strike movement in the capitalist countries. Honor and glory to the communists -- courageous fighters for the people's cause!

The characteristic feature of the Soviet people is solidarity with the peoples who have freed themselves from the colonial yoke and who are courageously fighting for the consolidation of national independence and social progress. On May Day, the CPSU Central Committee, on behalf of all our people, sends fervent greetings to those who are struggling against imperialism and racism and for freedom and independence in Africa, Asia and Latin America, against exploitation and oppression by the monopolies, reaction and fascism and for working people's rights. We support Soviet-Arab friendship and send greetings to the Arab peoples who are struggling against Israeli aggression and imperialism's diktat.

Greeting the joyous holiday of spring and labor, the Soviet people are proud that the USSR, which this year will be celebrating the 60th anniversary of its formation, is sparing no effort to strengthen the mighty and invincible alliance of the three main revolutionary forces of the present day -- world socialism, the international proletariat and the national liberation movement.

On May Day, which we are marking in single formation with all working people of the world, our people together with their dear party proclaim:

-- Long live the Soviet Union's peace-loving Leninist foreign policy!

May the Soviet peace program for the eighties be implemented in full!

GAS MINISTER INTERVIEWED BY NOVOYE VREMYA

LD061432 Moscow TASS in English 1421 GMT 6 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 6 May, TASS -- Gas output in the Soviet Union last year exceeded 465,000 million cubic metres, Vasilii Dinkov, minister of the gas industry of the USSR, said in an interview with the weekly NEW TIMES [NOVOYE VREMYA]. Western Siberia, the country's principal gas producer, continues to be developed at an accelerated pace, he pointed out. A total of five giant trunkline gas pipelines, linking western Siberia and the USSR's central regions, as well as an export gas pipeline from the Urengoy gas field in western Siberia to Uzhgorod on the USSR's western border are to be built and start carrying Siberian gas to consumers in the period between 1981 and 1985. The total length of these pipelines, according to Dinkov, will be over 21,000 kilometres.

The minister said that the Soviet Union today ranks second in the world in total gas production and leads the world as regards commercial gas reserves, the annual gas output growth rates and length of the main systems of trunkline gas pipelines. "In the near future," he went on, "we plan to outstrip the United States and take the world lead in gas output. We," Vasilii Dinkov emphasized, "are intensively developing our natural wealth by ourselves, but we do not renounce the advantages of the international division of labor. To secure export gas supplies, we buy pipes and gas pipeline equipment from Western countries while providing them with Soviet gas, which is of great importance to them for tackling their energy problems, to repay these deliveries."

The Soviet minister expressed the opinion that the "gas-pipes" agreement between the USSR and a number of West European countries, the biggest in the history of international trade and economic relations, "will help not only further expand mutually advantageous economic cooperation between our countries but also strengthen peace in Europe." Despite the U.S. administration's pressure, he said, work has begun to implement this agreement. West German firms are already supplying the USSR with pipes to carry Siberian gas to western Europe.

Touching on claims by some U.S. representatives that the Soviet Union allegedly will not be able to cope with the development of Siberia without Western help, Vasilii Dinkov said: "We will perform what we have planned in spite of any sanctions of the U.S. President." The tapping of West Siberian deposits, which are to account for the larger share of the projected gas output accretion, he continued, "is being carried out on the basis of home-made equipment. Therefore, the ban on U.S. plant supplies will not affect our plans in any way." Vasilii Dinkov emphasized that "the Soviet Union has tremendous gas reserves and is increasing gas production on a planned footing. There can be no fearing that these reserves may become exhausted even in the remote future."

The minister concluded by saying that the Ministry of the Gas Industry of the USSR cooperates with West Germany, the Netherlands, France, Japan and other capitalist countries in many fields related to the production and processing of gas.

CHANGES IN SYSTEM OF METAL PRODUCTION URGED

LD050917 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian on 18 April carries on page 2 a 2,200-word article under the rubric "Completing Operation 'Metal'" entitled "An Economy Strategy" by V. Kulikov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosnab, pointing out that production of finished rolled metal has not increased in the last 3 years and criticizing the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy for failing to overcome the "inertia of habit" underlying the continuing overemphasis on quantitative indicators rather than on the more efficient use of metal, including low-alloy steel and other efficient varieties of metal. The writer stresses the need to "radically change the system of planning indicators in metallurgical production" in order to increase production of efficient varieties of rolled metal and at the same time reduce the labor-intensiveness of the finished product, thereby conserving metal and increasing the volume and improving the quality of production.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN REPORTS PROJECTED MAY TEMPERATURES

PM070815 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 1 May 82 p 4

[USSR Hydrometeorological Center Report: "The Weather Ahead"]

[Text] May is expected to be warmer than usual in northern and northwestern regions of the European part of the USSR. During the month temperatures will average 2-6 degrees in the northernmost oblasts. Temperatures in Leningradskaya, Arkhangelskaya, Vologodskaya, Pskovskaya and Novgorodskaya Oblasts will average 9-12 degrees.

In the Central Region temperatures during the month are expected to average 11-14 degrees.

In oblasts in the Central Chernozem Zone air temperatures during the month will average 14-17 degrees.

In the Baltic republics air temperatures during the month are expected to average around 12-14 degrees and temperatures approaching 15-16 degrees are anticipated in Belorussia.

In Moldavia and the Ukraine, May temperatures are expected to fall to 3-8 degrees in the latter half of the month.

In the Volga Region temperature averages during the month are expected to range between 11-14 degrees in the upper Volga Region and 15-19 degrees in the lower Volga Region.

In the North Caucasus temperatures during the month are expected to average around 17 degrees.

In the transcaucasian republics May temperatures are expected to be close to normal. Air temperatures in Georgia will average 11-18 degrees, in Armenia 7-12 degrees and in Azerbaijan 15-19 degrees.

In the Urals average temperatures during the month are expected to be higher than usual: 10-13 degrees in the mid-Urals and 14-16 degrees in the southern Urals.

In farming regions of West Siberia air temperatures during the month will average 9-13 degrees.

In the Kazakh SSR temperatures are expected to average 14-18 degrees, with the exception of southern oblasts, where they are expected to average 19-22 degrees.

In the central Asian republics average temperatures during the month are expected in most oblasts to be up from previous years.

In central and southern parts of Krasnoyarskiy Kray temperatures will average 5-11 degrees; in Evenkiya, plus 4-minus 5 degrees, and in the Taymyrskiy Autonomous Okrug, minus 6-minus 11 degrees. Temperatures will average minus 5-plus 5 degrees in central parts of Yakutia and 6-8 degrees in southern parts of the republic.

In the Far East May temperatures close to average for previous years are expected in most parts: 10-12 degrees in Primorskiy Kray, 3-12 degrees in Khabarovsk and plus 2-minus 5 degrees in Magadanskaya Oblast.

EIGHT COSMOS-CLASS SATELLITES LAUNCHED 6 MAY

LD070840 Moscow TASS in English 0834 GMT 7 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 7 May, TASS -- The Soviet Union launched eight Cosmos-class artificial earth satellites (numbers 1357 through 1364) by a single booster rocket on Thursday.

They are fitted with instruments for conducting exploration of outer space. All the eight sputniks were inserted into orbiting paths which are close to those desired with the following initial parameters: period of revolution -- 115.4 minutes, maximum distance from the earth's surface -- 1,520 kilometres, minimum distance -- 1,449 kilometres, inclination of the orbit -- 74 degrees.

The on-board equipment is functioning properly.

TASS REPORTS EARTHQUAKE IN SOUTHERN REPUBLICS

LD071150 Moscow TASS in English 1116 GMT 7 May 82

[Text] Moscow, 7 May, TASS -- An earthquake, measuring seven in its epicentre, occurred in the territory of Kirgizia, Uzbekistan and Tadzhikistan Thursday at 19 hours 42 minutes Moscow time. The focus of the earth tremors was 20 kilometres to the north of the town of Kyzyl-Kiya and 35 kilometres to the east of Fergana.

The earthquake measured up to six points was felt in Kyzyl-Kiya and Fergana, and about five points in Tashkent, Osh and Namangan. Shocks from the earthquake in the foothills of the Alai mountain range were felt in many regions of Tadzhikistan.

The shocks registering 3-4 points took place in Dushanbe and Khorog.

Damage was inflicted to some old type buildings and livestock premises in the regions situated close to the epicentre of the earthquake.